The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, JANUARY 12, 1884.

CURRENT TOPICS.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR will sit with the Court of Appeal during the absence on circuit of three of its members. Lord Justice FRY does not leave town for circuit until the 17th inst.

UP TO THE TIME of our going to press we believe that the arrangements for disposing of the work of Mr. Justice NORTH during his absence on circuit had not been completed.

ONE OF THE ROOMS in the Royal Courts of Justice which, previously to May, 1883, were set apart for the use of Mr. JOHN ROMILLY, as Secretary of the Rolls, has been appropriated for the sale of judicature stamps and bankruptcy forms. The room is No. 420, and is situated close to the Carey-street entrance.

MR. C. H. PRICE, who has for many years been Chief Clerk to the Chancery Paymaster, has retired from that office on a pension. It is understood that on the coming into operation of the Supreme Court of Judicature (Funds) Rules, in March next, numerous other changes will occur in the office, which will then become the office of the Paymaster of the Supreme Court.

THE LIST OF APPEALS for Hilary Sittings comprises 168 final appeals and 21 interlocutory appeals from the Chancery Division, the Probate and Divorce Divisions, and from the County Palatine of Lancaster and the Stannaries Court; 107 final appeals from the Queen's Bench and Admiralty Divisions, 15 appeals for hearing with nautical assessors; 31 interlocutory appeals from the same divisions, and 30 bankruptcy appeals; making a total of 375 appeals as against 399 at the beginning of Michaelmas Sittings, and 231 in Hilary, 1883. The earliest of the appeals in this list was set down in February, 1883, and nearly 20 have been added to the list since the commencement of the present year.

THE CHANCERY CAUSE LISTS exhibit a total of 825 causes, and comprise 109 set down before Vice-Chancellor BACON; 166 before Mr. Justice KAY; 215 before Mr. Justice CHITTY; 114 before Mr. Justice NORTH; and 221 before Mr. Justice PEARSON. At Michaelmas last the total was 809, and a year ago the total was 816. The characteristic of the list is the number of witness causes. Of the total number of causes 425 are witness causes, and of the remaining 400, several will, probably, be marked as witness causes before they come on for hearing.

THE LIST OF CAUSES set down to be heard by the judges of the Queen's Bench Division consists of 31 in the new trial paper, 6 in the special paper, 45 opposed motions, 50 in the Crown paper, and 6 in the Revenue paper. There is, moreover, a list of 473 causes for trial with juries, and 402 without juries, besides 14 bankruptcy cases before Mr. Justice CAVE. These cases add up to a total of 1,025, as against 1,120 in Michaelmas Sittings, and 773 in Hilary Sittings, 1883.

THE LIST OF CAUSES to be disposed of by the judges of the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Divisions contains 25 probate causes to be heard without a jury, 13 with a common jury, and 11 with a special jury. There is a list of 112 undefended matrimonial causes, and 102 defended, 6 of which latter are to be heard with a special jury, and 16 with a common jury; and in addition to these numbers, 88 matrimonial causes stand over by consent. There are also 20 admiralty cases in the list. The total of the list of this division amounts to 411 causes as against 371 in Michaelmas Sittings, 1883, and 174 in Hilary Sittings, 1883.

MR. JOSEPH COWEN'S Bill for the establishment of district courts, which caused so much commotion on the silly rumour that it was to be adopted as a Government measure, was discussed at a recent meeting of the Associated Provincial Law Societies, when it was resolved, "That no scheme for facilitating the administration of justice in the provinces will be acceptable to suitors or the profession which, as a leading provision, provides for the trial of causes not included within the present or any amended jurisdiction of the county courts, before judges other than judges of the High Court." It may, therefore, be taken on the authority of a body which represents the country solicitors, and certainly knows the wishes and requirements of country suitors, that the promoters of the District Courts Bill offer to these classes something which they do not want. They want to have their civil actions tried before judges of the High Court, while Mr. COWEN'S Bill proposes that they should be tried before a magnified county court judge. We suppose there can be little doubt as to the fate of Mr. COWEN'S Bill. As to the proposal that continuous sittings of the judges of the High Court should be held in the leading centres of commerce throughout the country, there is a great deal both in the way of argument and of authority to be adduced in its favour. There is in particular the recommendation of Lord CAIRNS in the memorandum appended to the second report of the Judicature Commission. On the other hand, there are practical difficulties in the way of the adoption of the proposal, if carried out to the extent suggested. It would involve an entire remodelling of the assize system, and a considerable increase in the number of judges of the High Court. We confess we do not see why the less ambitious proposals of the Judicature Commissioners, with reference to Manchester and Liverpool, should not be adopted and extended to other populous centres. Those proposals were that there should be four sittings in the year for the trial of civil causes; that the duration of these sittings should not be limited, and that it should not be necessary for the same judge to be in attendance during the whole of each sitting.

THERE IS A VERY STRONG IMPRESSION in professional circles most likely to possess accurate knowledge, that the new Bankruptcy Act, by reason of its very stringency, will cause private schemes of arrangement to be oftener resorted to than has been the case during the existence of the Act which has just expired. In ordinary cases there seems to be good reason to suppose that this impression is correct, as, on the one hand, debtors will have every inducement to escape the public examination of their affairs and conduct which is made compulsory in every case; for even though their conduct may not lay them open to any of the penalties provided by the Act, still there will naturally be a desire to avoid having their affairs discussed in public for the edification of their neighbours; whilst, on the other hand, unless there has been some gross misconduct or fraud on the part of the debtor, or there is some object to be gained by going into bankruptcy, such as the voiding of executions, voluntary settlements, or fraudulent preferences, creditors will desire to have the assets distributed amongst them with the least possible cost and greatest possible expedition. It is clear that the more cumbersome the procedure provided in bankruptcy the greater will be the cost of carrying that procedure out, and the procedure

provided by the new Act is about the most cumbersome that has ever yet been enacted in this country. Probably the most frequent plan for a private administration of the affairs of a debtor outside the Act will be by a deed of assignment for general benefit of creditors. This method was frequently adopted even whilst the late Act was in existence, but the chief objection to that course was the great length of time (twelve months) during which the execution of such a deed would remain an act of bankruptcy to which the title of a trustee in bankruptcy would relate back. We discussed this point at some length in these columns (26 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, p. 225), and we then suggested that statutory provisions should be made with regard to such deeds. Our suggestion has not been adopted, but the Legislature (probably unconsciously) has provided great facilities for the carrying out of such deeds by reducing the time during which they shall remain acts of bankruptcy to which the title of a trustee in bankruptcy will relate back to three months from the presentation of the petition. We anticipate, therefore, that this method of administering the estates of insolvents will now be frequently resorted to, and we have pleasure in laying before our readers for their consideration a general form of the trusts in a deed of assignment for benefit of creditors with which we have been furnished, and which has been prepared for use in the office of a firm of solicitors having a very extensive practice in bankruptcy. The form is not sent as being by any means perfect, but as affording a hint of the general scheme of such deeds. We give the form as it is sent to us, and we shall be glad to have the suggestions of any of our readers upon it. It will be observed that the form follows, as far as practicable, the practice in liquidations by arrangement provided under the Act of 1869.

A CURIOUS QUESTION upon the meaning of the expression "permitting drunkenness," in the 12th section of the Licensing Act, 1872, was raised at the Surrey Sessions, this week, in an appeal by a licensed victualler against a conviction for that offence. The case against the appellant rested upon the evidence of two constables who admitted, on cross-examination, that the persons to whom the charge referred were drunk before they went into the appellant's house. The point of law was at once taken that, this being so, the appellant could not legally be convicted, and the court yielded to this contention, and ordered the conviction to be quashed. On a first impression, we are somewhat surprised at the result. In *Ethelstane* v. *Oswestry Justices* (33 L. T. N. S. 339), however, in which it was held that a conviction may be obtained against a licensed person upon evidence that a person who had been drinking on the premises was found drunk at some distance from them, COCKBURN, C.J., observed, "If a man goes into a public-house sober and comes out drunk, surely that is some evidence that he got drunk within the house, and that his drunkenness was permitted by the publican," and from this it would seem that the late Lord Chief Justice of England was of opinion that the drunkenness out of which the offence springs must, in order to obtain a conviction for "permitting drunkenness," be wholly the work of the offending publican. Add to this that the supplying intoxicating liquor to a drunken person is a separate offence under the same 12th section of the Act, and it would seem that there is much to be said in support of the judgment of the court. For it appears certain from *Martin* v. *Widgeon* (28 L. J. M. C. 179) that a person cannot, if charged with the offence of drunkenness accompanied by disorder, be convicted of drunkenness alone, and it would seem that the offences of permitting drunkenness and selling liquor to a drunken person are none the less distinct. Technically, therefore, the court appears to have been right. But we cannot help thinking that the strictness of the provision of section 10 of Jervis' Act, that "every information shall be for one offence only, and not for two or more offences," has frequently done more harm than good, and that some power of amending informations might reasonably be given to justices of the peace.

WE OBSERVE that at the Stoke Newington inquest the coroner marked as "not sworn" the deposition of a child who was, as he decided, legally ignorant of the nature of an oath. The question whether children of tender years can legally "affirm" has, so far as we know, never yet been raised in a court of law. Sir JAMES STEPHEN says in his work on Evidence (p. 131), "The practice of insisting on a child's belief in punishment in a future state for lying as a condition of the admissibility of its evidence leads to anecdotes and to scenes little calculated to increase respect either for religion or for the administration of justice"; and every one who reads the report of the Stoke Newington inquest will be inclined to agree with him. But he adds that the Evidence Amendment Act, 1869, which was passed to make the testimony of atheists admissible, "seems to render this unnecessary," for "if a person who deliberately and advisedly rejects all belief in God and a future state is a competent witness, *à fortiori* a child who has received no instruction on the subject must be competent also." We cannot concur in this view. The statute provides that, "if any person called to give evidence . . . shall object to take an oath, or shall be objected to as incompetent to take an oath, such person shall, if the presiding judge is satisfied that the taking of an oath would have no binding effect on his conscience," make a declaration in the form prescribed. We cannot but think that these words include adults only; and we believe that the universal practice, since the passing of the Act of 1869, has been to examine children on the *voir dire* in the same way as before the Act, and wholly to reject their testimony if their answers show an ignorance of a Supreme Power who will punish falsehood, either in this world or the next (see *Omichund* v. *Barker*, 1 Atk. 49). The question is an important one from two practical points of view—first, would a conviction, obtained partly on the evidence of a child affirming under the Act, be upheld by a court of criminal appeal? secondly, could a child so affirming be convicted of perjury?

THE OPINIONS which have been elicited by the discussion which has recently taken place as to prisoners' statements are certainly remarkable. According to the Lord Chief Justice's letter to Sir HENRY JAMES the judges resolved in 1881:—"That it is contrary to the administration and practice of the criminal law, as hitherto allowed, that counsel for prisoners should state to the jury, as alleged existing facts, matters which they have been told in their instructions, on the authority of the prisoner, but which they do not propose to prove in evidence." A correspondent of the *Times*, who may, we suppose, without doubt, be identified as Lord BRAMWELL, perhaps the most eminent and experienced judge now living, backed up this resolution by a statement that the decision of Lord Chief Justice COCKBURN in *Reg.* v. *Weston* (14 Cox. C. C. 346), that the prisoner's counsel might give the prisoner's account of the matter, was "an entire novelty." And he added that "There had never before been a doubt or question on the matter." Mr. Justice WATKIN WILLIAMS, thereupon, wrote to say that the resolution of the judges was not, nor was it considered to be, binding upon any non-assenting person. "It does not profess to be the enactment of a rule of practice, nor a 'decision' upon any point of practice or procedure, much less upon any question of substantive law. It is nothing more than a private and purely informal expression of opinion elicited from a certain number of the circuit-going judges as to what the practice had theretofore been, according to their experience. It was not even a declaration of opinion by the judicial body as such, as I shall show in a moment. I was a member of the bench at the time, but I was not present at the meeting, from what cause I have no recollection. I never received any notice of anyone's intention to propose such a resolution, nor have I ever to this day received any notice of such a resolution having been adopted, and I was in entire ignorance of its existence until the fact came to light in the course of the recent discussion that followed the O'Donnell trial. In the meantime, the question had several times arisen before myself; and under the impression that I was acting according to the accepted practice, as it had been laid down by Lord Chief Justice COCKBURN, I allowed the prisoner, by the mouth of his counsel, to state his version of the facts to the jury without proof. And, in addition to this, I never refused liberty to a prisoner to make a further statement himself if he desired it." To this Lord BRAMWELL rejoined that the resolution was not binding, "and that is the thing that most especially justifies it. Judges having jurisdiction to give binding decisions ought, when they exercise it, to be attended by counsel if possible;" and he advised Mr. Justice WATKIN

Williams to raise the point for the Court of Criminal Appeal by disallowing a statement by a prisoner. This the latter learned judge refuses to do, on the ground that it would "be highly unconstitutional, and a violation of my oath, to deprive a prisoner upon his trial for one hour of what I honestly believe to be his sacred right according to the law of England merely for the purpose of settling a disputed point of law." With great deference to Lord Bramwell, it is to be hoped that no judge will follow his advice. The matter is one which, until Parliament interferes and establishes the rule that prisoners may, if they like, give evidence subject to the same conditions as other witnesses, is much better left to the discretion of the judge in each case.

We understand that the case, to which we referred some time ago (*ante*, p. 114), and which has excited considerable attention in the profession, in which Mr. Justice Kay refused, after an order on further consideration had been made, to vary a certificate of the chief clerk, which erroneously failed to give credit to a party for £500, is now the subject of an appeal.

THE PATENTS, DESIGNS, AND TRADE-MARKS RULES.

II.

The new Trade-Marks Rules are more easily capable of comparison with the old rules than are those for Patents or Designs, since the system to which they relate is less changed; but, at the same time, the rules themselves are a good deal more altered than there appears to have been any real necessity for. The result, of course, is that what has been learned has to be unlearned, and that a number of new questions will have to be decided as time goes on. The old rules, if they may be called so, for the last edition of them was only issued in March last, contained seventy rules, twenty-five items of fees, and two forms. Many of these rules have been introduced into the Act, all the cotton rules are dropped, and yet the new set contains sixty rules, twenty-nine items of fees, and eighteen forms. Even so, the new rules are not complete. Thus, there is a form of opposition given, but none of a counter-statement; a fee is paid for an application for registration of one mark for one class; but it is nowhere stated that the same fee is to be charged for each class in which application is made for the same mark, though this appears to be the case, contrary to the old system, by which registration in subsequent classes could be applied for at a reduced rate. As to the forms, the form for counter-statement is of equal consequence with the form for notice of opposition, and the fact that no fee is charged for the form does not seem a reason for omitting it from the schedule. However, the schedule of forms is undoubtedly a great improvement on the former one, as, though not complete, it contains a number which had previously to be invented from time to time.

The observations made in connection with the Patents Rules with respect to conducting correspondence through agents, posting communications, and the Comptroller-General's discretionary and dispensing powers, apply also to the case of trade-marks, but there are a a number of other provisions which are peculiar to the latter, and which are also new. No declaration as to the applicant's title is now necessary, and the application may be made through an agent, but where the mark is an old one there is, by rule 10, to be a statement in the application of the time during which, and of the person by whom it has been used. In applications for trade-marks for metal goods, other than cutlery, edge tools, and raw steel, the metal or metals are to be specified. Three representations of each mark are to be supplied, except in classes 23 to 35, which may be roughly described as the textile classes, and in those classes four representations are required. Where the application is one made to the Sheffield Cutlers' Company, under section 81 of the Act, it has to be made in duplicate.

One of the innovations of the Act is that contained in section 66, authorizing the registration of series of trade-marks which differ from one another only in respect of certain non-essential particulars. Rule 14 is intended to meet these cases, and requires that in such cases a representation of each of the marks included in the series shall be placed upon the application form, and also upon each of the representation papers; and by rule 28 the applicant may (with a view to the advertisement) be required to furnish a wood block or electrotype, or more than one, if necessary, of any or each of the marks constituting the series, and the comptroller may, if he thinks fit, insert with the advertisement of the application a statement of the manner in which the different marks in the series differ from one another. No form is provided for applications for registration of a series. Where words printed in other than Roman character appear in a mark, a translation thereof is to be given on the representation, and signed by the applicant or his agent (rule 15).

Rules 20 to 24 relate to appeals to the Board of Trade, and open up quite a new point. Hitherto, when the registrar has refused to register a trade-mark, the course pursued has been to apply to the court by summons or motion, the registrar has or has not resisted the application, and an order has been made. Appeals have been very rare. Section 62 of the Act provides, however, for an appeal in such cases from the comptroller to the Board of Trade, who have power, if they choose, to refer the matter to the court. The intention of this seems to be that the justice of the comptroller's action is to be considered by the Board of Trade, unless they think it expedient to refer it to the court. The idea, no doubt, is that it would be cheaper to go before the Board, but we think it very doubtful whether this idea is well founded, and applicants can hardly find the Board more accessible to valid claims than the court has been, while its decisions will scarcely carry equal weight. But it is a singular thing that, while section 62 provides for an appeal to the Board, section 90 provides that on the application of any person aggrieved by the omission without sufficient cause of the name of any person from any register kept under the Act (including, therefore, the trade-marks register), the court may make such order for making the entry as it thinks fit. These words appear to precisely fit the case of an applicant for registration, whose name the comptroller has refused to register as that of the proprietor of a trade-mark; so that, taking the words of the Act literally, there would appear to be a concurrent right of appeal to the Board and to the court. The fact is that the appeal to the Board is only a perplexing interpolation, to which it may be hoped that effect will not often be given, and the language of rules 23 and 24 seems to indicate that in some cases, at least, appeals will be referred by the Board to the court under the powers given them. If the applicant is allowed to avail himself of section 90, and go direct to the court if he prefers it, no great harm will be done by the Board itself hearing his appeal if he choose to appeal to that body, but it would be far simpler if in all such cases the disappointed applicant were required to follow the same course as hitherto, and go straight to the court. If the Board hears the appeal and gives an adverse decision, the applicant is sure to be dissatisfied with his tribunal; if it refers the appeal to the court, needless delay and expense will have been occasioned; it will be only in the cases in which it hears the appeal and gives a favourable decision that the applicant will be satisfied, and even then it will be open to the court, on a subsequent application by a person aggrieved, to remove the mark from the register, on the ground that it ought never to have been placed there.

Though the Cotton Rules are swept away altogether, it may still be anticipated that marks placed by the defunct Committee of Experts in the B. list will be refused registration by the comptroller. This would, perhaps, afford an opportunity in which the appellate jurisdiction of the Board of Trade might be exercised without risk, as the court has, it is believed, without a single exception, decided in favour of appellants under such circumstances. Still, if the Board decided adversely, the applicant would apparently have no right of appeal; whereas, if he went to the court, he could take the case up higher if he failed in the first instance, so that, even in such cases, recourse would be had to the court, if possible. The rules, by the way, no longer specify the court, which, by the Act, is defined to be the High Court of Justice; but it seems hardly doubtful that parties will still resort to the Chancery Division.

The rules make no reference in terms to applications for trade-marks by foreign subjects, nor does the Act, either in section 62 or in its definition of "person," though by section 4 any person, "whether a British subject or not," may apply for a patent. By

the old rules aliens were expressly allowed to apply for, and to obtain, registration, and, as there is no limitation of persons entitled to apply to subjects, it would seem that the old practice would continue to be followed. By sections 103 and 104 priority is to be given to natives of foreign countries or colonies with whom the Crown has made arrangements, but this does not prevent foreigners or colonists from applying on equal terms with others, though their Governments have made no compact. If they carried on no business in the United Kingdom, there would be no goodwill, and it would seem that the fact of an application would indicate that they intended to carry on business there, but, in any case, no statement to that effect is required by the form of application.

The 29th rule alters the mode of procedure in cases of opposed applications in a way to which there can be no objection. Hitherto, when a case has stood for the determination of the court, the registrar has called upon the opponent to take some step to bring it before the court, on pain of his opposition being deemed to be abandoned, and he has thereupon invariably, of late years, taken out a summons for directions which has resulted in the applicant being directed to take out a summons for leave to register, notwithstanding the opposition. The superfluous summons for directions is now dispensed with, and the applicant is to be required by the comptroller to take out his summons for leave to register, in default of which his application is to be deemed to be abandoned.

An opportunity for another simplification has been neglected in rule 42, which still requires a special case when each of several persons claims to be registered as proprietor of the same trade-mark, unless the court otherwise orders. This has been the nominal rule ever since the first set of trade-marks rules was issued, but, in point of fact, after the first one or two attempts to carry out the rule, not a single instance of a special case has been known, the parties being invariably at arm's length and utterly incapable of agreeing on a statement of facts or anything else. The practical way of dealing with the question would have been to allow the whole matter to be fought out on opposed applications for registration, resulting in cross-summonses for leave to register. The alteration would only be in words, for this is the way in which the matter is really settled at present, the leave of the court being invariably obtainable.

Registration is now to be effected at the end of two, instead of three, months from the first advertisement of the application (rule 30); subsequent proprietors who seek registration as such must supply a statutory declaration giving the details of their claim, and further evidence if required, so that the ownership of a mark may not be wrongfully transferred from one to another (rule 37), and very wide powers of amendment in documents are permitted with the approval of the comptroller (rule 51). Rules 53 to 56 contain the new regulations with respect to the Cutlers' Company of Sheffield, the proceedings on applications at Sheffield being made to resemble very closely those on applications in London.

A singular omission from the rules is that of the provision previously contained in rule 33, by which any person aggrieved could obtain the removal from the register of a trade-mark the proprietor of which had not been carrying on business for five years in any goods in the same class as the goods for which the mark was registered. The extreme inconvenience of allowing the register to be incumbered by a mass of dead trade-marks is so obvious that the intention can hardly have been to do away with the provision altogether; probably the framers of the rules relied on section 70 of the Act, by which a trade-mark is determinable with the goodwill, and section 90, by which, on the application of any person aggrieved by any entry made without sufficient cause in any register, the court may order it to be expunged. But an entry made at a time when business was being actually carried on could hardly be said to have been made without sufficient cause, while the subsequent cessation of the business would cause, not the making of the entry, but its continuance on the register, to be a grievance. It may possibly be held that the words of the section are sufficiently wide, and their intention sufficiently obvious, to cover the case suggested, but it would surely have been better to keep the positive rule, though with improved language.

There is little more to say about these rules. The fees, like those for designs, seem trifling after those demanded in connection with patents, and the forms, though now placed in the rules for the first time, are generally very simple, and, in several cases, old. It is a pity that the three sets of rules were prepared with such complete secrecy, and without any opportunity for suggestions being given to persons practically interested; the Act itself benefited much by such suggestions, and there is no doubt that the rules would have been free from some blemishes if they had been made public before being enacted. Still, the Patents Rules in particular are a great advance upon anything previously in use, and when they come to be revised, after being brought to the test of experience, there ought to be no difficulty in settling them in a form to last for many years.

THE NEW BANKRUPTCY SYSTEM.

IV.

Section 55 relates to the disclaimer of onerous property, and, whilst taking the place of sections 23 and 24 of the Act of 1869, it effects some most important amendments therein. In sub-section 1 the word "unmarketable" has been omitted before, and the words "or stock" inserted after the word "shares" in line 3; the words "but subject to the provisions of this section," in line 9, are new; the words "signed by him" are substituted for "under his hand" in line 10; and the words "at any time within three months after the first appointment of a trustee" in lines 9 and 10, as well as the proviso limiting the application of those words at the end of the sub-section, are also new. The proviso was inserted by the House of Lords. Sub-section 2 is altogether different from the corresponding provision in section 23 of the Act of 1869. In the first place, the disclaimer is to operate "as from the date of the disclaimer" instead of the date of the receiving order, as appeared in the Bill as originally introduced, and of the date of the order of adjudication as appears in the Act of 1869, an amendment also made by the House of Lords, and which effects a most important alteration in the law. The other alterations in the law effected by the sub-section (which also underwent considerable amendments in the House of Lords) will be found on comparison to be most material and a very decided improvement in the previous law. Sub-section 3 corresponds with rule 28 of the Bankruptcy Rules, 1871, but differs from that rule in many of its details. The exception "in any cases which may be prescribed by general rules" is new, and the power to "impose such terms as a condition of granting leave, and make such orders with regard to fixtures, tenant's improvements, and other matters arising out of the tenancy as the court thinks just," takes the place of the words "and such order shall be made thereon as the court shall think fit." Having regard to the substitution in sub-section 2 of "the date of the disclaimer" for "the date of the order of adjudication," we cannot see why the reference to tenant's fixtures in sub-section 3 has been retained. Rule 232 has been prescribed under this sub-section, and it will be seen that the cases excepted by that rule from the operation of the sub-section are very important, and will effect a considerable saving of expense in the great majority of cases where trustees are compelled to disclaim onerous leases. Sub-section 4 is substantially the same as section 24 of the Act of 1869, with the addition of the words at the end relating to the case of a contract which were inserted in Grand Committee, and which will apparently have the effect of reversing the law as laid down in *Ex parte Davis, Re Sneezum* (25 W. R. 49, L. R. 3 Ch. D. 463). Sub-section 5 is a new provision, and sub-section 6 makes some important amendments in the law with regard to the position of a sub-lessee or mortgagee by demise of a lease disclaimed with the object of meeting the difficulties and hardships experienced under the old law as appearing by a long series of cases. The proviso which forms the second part of the sub-section was inserted in Grand Committee at the instance of Mr. Gregory. Sub-section 7 is the same as the concluding part of section 23 of the Act of 1869, with the insertion of the words "a disclaimer under" in the first line thereof. Section 56 corresponds with section 25 of the Act of 1869, but the three first sub-sections of the latter section are omitted. Of these sub-section 1 is provided for by rules 22 and 26 in the second schedule to the Act, and the other two sub-sections are transferred into the next section. Sub-section 1 corresponds with sub-section 6 of the section in the Act of 1869, with verbal alterations only; sub-section 2 with sub-section 7 of the same; sub-section 3 with sub-section 8 of the same; sub-section 4 with sub-section 8 of the same, with the omission of the words "expedient or necessary" after the word "instruments"; and sub-section 5 with sub-section 4 of the same.

Section 57 takes the place of sections 27 and 29 of the Act of 1869, and effects some amendments in those sections. Sub-sections 1 and 2 are taken from section 25 of the Act of 1869, so that a trustee under the new Act will only be able to exercise the powers mentioned in those sub-sections with the permission of the committee of inspection, instead of at his own option, as he is able to do under the old Act. Sub-section 3 corresponds with section 29 of the Act of 1869, but the provision relating to a trustee being a solicitor contracting

for a remuneration contained in that section is here omitted, it being provided for by sub-section 2 of section 73. Sub-section 4 is a new provision which, we think, will be found very beneficial in practice. It often occurs that a much better price can be obtained for an estate by selling it for payments at deferred dates, but trustees under the Act of 1869 could only sell in this manner at their own personal risk, which they could not be advised to do, though, as a matter of fact, they have frequently done so when satisfied with the security given. Sub-sections 5 to 9 are the same as sub-sections 1 to 5 of section 27 of the Act of 1869, with an unimportant verbal alteration in sub-section 6, and the insertion of the word "readily" in sub-section 9 only. The concluding part of the section is altogether different from the concluding part of the section in the Act of 1869, in so far as it prohibits a general permission from being given, which was expressly allowed by the Act of 1869.

Sections 58 to 65, which form the concluding sections of Part III., relate to the distribution of property. Sub-sections 1 to 3 of section 58 correspond with section 41 of the Act of 1869, and effect the following alterations. By the section in the Act of 1869 the trustee is to declare dividends "when the committee of inspection determines." Under the new Act he must do so with all convenient speed, and the first dividend must be declared within four months after the first meeting, "unless the trustee satisfies the committee that there is sufficient reason for postponing the declaration to a later date." It will be seen that it is the committee that have to be satisfied with respect to the first dividend; but the words of sub-section 3, regulating subsequent dividends, are, that they "shall, in the absence of sufficient reason to the contrary, be declared and distributed at intervals of not more than six months." Having regard to section 91, we assume that it is the Board of Trade that must be satisfied that there is "sufficient reason to the contrary" in sub-section 3, but why there should be any difference in this respect between first and subsequent dividends we fail to see. Sub-section 4 is substantially the same as rule 131 of the Rules of 1870, and sub-section 5 corresponds with rule 132 of the same rules, but omits the requirement contained in the rule to gazette the notice of a dividend having been declared (this, however, being provided for by rule 175, clause 4), and the provision that "a statement in the prescribed form as to the particulars of the estate" shall be sent to the creditors with the notice is new. Sub-section 1 of section 59 is the same as section 103 of the Act of 1869, with the omission of the words relating to the power of a joint creditor to vote under a separate bankruptcy, which provision is made by rule 13 of the second schedule. Sub-section 2 is a *verbatim* re-enactment of section 104 of the Act of 1869. Section 60 corresponds with section 42 of the same Act, but the provision as to disputed proof or claims and expenses, and the distribution of all money in hand, is new. Section 61 is a re-enactment, with a few unimportant verbal amendments of section 43 of the Act of 1869, and the first four lines, with the word "dividend" on the fifth line of section 62, are a like re-enactment of section 44 of the same Act, the rest of the section being new. Section 63 is also a similar re-enactment of section 46 of the same Act. Sub-section 1 of section 64 is the same as section 26 of the same Act, with the insertion of the words "with the permission of the committee of inspection," and the substitution of the trustee for the creditors at the end. Sub-section 2 is similar to section 38 of the same Act, substituting the committee of inspection for the creditors, and with the addition of the words, "but any such allowance may be reduced by the court;" and section 65 is substantially the same as section 45 of the same Act, the wording being more specific, but not altering the provision of that section. Additional provisions as to the declaration and distribution of dividends are also made by general rules 175 to 177, with which we will deal hereafter in discussing those rules as a whole.

We have already discussed the provisions of Part IV. relating to official receivers and staff of the Board of Trade, which comprises sections 66 to 71 (*ante*, p. 3, and 27 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, pp. 344, 359), and we need not further refer to them except that in passing we call attention to sub-section 3 of section 69 and compare it with the first part of sub-section 5 of section 17. As originally introduced, the latter provision was in similar words as the former—viz., "The official receiver shall take *such* part in the examination of the debtor *as the Board of Trade may direct*," but in Grand Committee the words in italics were struck out. We should have thought that consistency would also have required the omission of the same words in the other sub-section. Some additional provisions with regard to official receivers are also made by General Rules 233 to 250, which we will discuss hereafter.

Part V., consisting of sections 72 to 91, contains provisions with respect to trustees in bankruptcy. Section 72 relates to the remuneration of a trustee, and sub-section 1 makes a considerable alteration in the law as to the mode of calculating the same by commission as therein provided, instead of leaving the remuneration entirely to the creditors as was done by section 14 of the Act of 1869. Sub-sections 2 and 3 are new provisions carrying out the alterations made by sub-section 1, and sub-section 4 is the same as rule 108 of the Rules of 1870, with unimportant verbal alterations. Sub-section 5 is again a new provision, the first part of which was inserted in Grand Committee at the instance of Mr. Dixon-Hartland, and the latter part was inserted in the House of Lords. We heartily hope the provision will be successful in its design to put down the mischievous system of division of costs between persons employed about a bankruptcy which is now only too commonly practised. Section 73 relates to the allowance and taxation of costs. Sub-section 1 is new, and directed against such practices as trustees employing solicitors to send out formal notices to creditors. Sub-section 2 is the same as a provision in section 29 of the Act of 1869, and sub-section 3 is in substance the same as rule 4 of the Rules of 1871. Sub-section 4 is also a new provision.

Sections 74 to 81 relate to receipts, payments, accounts, and audit, and we commented upon most of these in a former article on the New Bankruptcy Authority (*ante*, p. 3). Section 74 corresponds in subject with section 30 of the Act of 1869, but it will be seen it differs very materially from that section in the provisions relating to the appointment of a bank and in investing the Board of Trade with the powers mentioned in the section. Section 75 further carries out the principles of section 74. Section 76, relating to the investment of surplus funds, is an entirely new provision, designed with the object of raising funds to be available for the working of the Act; and section 77 relates to the payment of salaries and expenses under the Act. The audit of trustees' accounts is provided for by section 78. The system of audit of such accounts will be a considerable change from that provided by the Act of 1869, the Board of Trade being substituted as the authority to audit such accounts for the Comptroller in Bankruptcy, but the previous audit by the committee of inspection is still retained by rules 209 and 210. Section 79 is a new provision, and was inserted in Grand Committee at the instance of Sir John Lubbock, being taken from the Bill introduced by him. Section 80 corresponds with the concluding part of section 22 of the Act of 1869, and the practice under that section is substantially adhered to by rules 207 and 208. Sub-section 1 of section 81 corresponds with section 56 of the Act of 1869, substituting the Board of Trade for the Comptroller in Bankruptcy and omitting the latter part as to contempt of court, there being other provisions as to this in a subsequent part of the Act (sub-section 5 of section 102); and sub-section 2 corresponds with section 57 of the same Act, with the like substitution and omission.

Section 82 contains provisions as to the release of a trustee, taking the place of sections 51 and 53 of the Act of 1869. A very considerable change in the law has been made on this point—first, by the omission of any provision for the formal close of a bankruptcy; and, secondly, by the substitution of the Board of Trade for both the Comptroller in Bankruptcy and the court. Sub-section 4 is similar to rule 124 of the Rules of 1870, substituting the official receiver for the registrar. Section 83 is a re-enactment of sub-section 7 of section 83 of the Act of 1869, the words "in any part of the British dominions or elsewhere," being, however, new, but do not seem to make any alteration in the law. Sections 84 to 87 contain provisions as to the appointment and removal of trustees. Of these, section 84 is a re-enactment of sub-section 1 of section 83 of the Act of 1869, the words "or failing to give security, or not being approved of by the Board of Trade," at the end of sub-section 2, however, being new. Section 85 corresponds with sub-section 5 of the same section of the Act of 1869, the process of a receiving order being made being substituted for the trustee being adjudged bankrupt, and the latter part of the sub-section in the old Act being provided for by section 87. Section 86, relating to the removal of a trustee, corresponds with sub-section 4 of section 83 of the Act of 1869, an "ordinary" resolution being substituted for a "special" one, the Board of Trade for the court, and "if the Board of Trade are of opinion that a trustee appointed by the creditors is guilty of misconduct, or fails to perform his duties under this Act," for "upon cause shown." The power given to the trustee or creditors to appeal to the High Court "if the creditors, by ordinary resolution, disapprove of his removal," is also new, a right to appeal being given by section 71 of the Act of 1869 to "any person aggrieved by any order" made in a bankruptcy as therein provided. The procedure with regard to the removal of a trustee by the Board of Trade is regulated by rule 222. Section 87 is also a re-enactment, with amendments, of several provisions of the Act of 1869. Sub-section 1 corresponds with sub-section 2 of section 83 of that Act, the omission after the word "trustee" of the words "by death, resignation, or otherwise," having the effect of incorporating the latter part of sub-section 5 of the same section in the Act of 1869, and the words "and thereupon the same proceedings shall be taken as in the case of a first appointment" taking the place of the words "and the court shall give a certificate declaring him to be the trustee," which appear in sub-section 4 of section 83 of the Act of 1869. In sub-section 2, the official receiver is substituted for the registrar, as in sub-section 2 of the same section in the old Act. Sub-section 3 is a new provision, similar to sub-sections 6 and 7 of section 27 of the new Act; and sub-section 4 corresponds with sub-section 3 of section 83 of the Act of 1869, the official receiver being

substituted for the registrar. Section 88, limiting the voting powers of a trustee and other persons under his influence on any resolution affecting his remuneration or conduct is also new, and is a very wise provision.

Sections 89 to 91 relate to the control over trustees. Sections 89 and 90 are re-enactments of certain provisions in section 20 of the Act of 1869, the words "subject to the provisions of this Act," at the commencement of sub-section 1 of section 89, the words "in case of conflict," near the end of the same sub-section, the obligatory provision as to summoning meetings of creditors in certain events in sub-section 2 of the same section, and the words "or decision," in two places in section 90, being, however, new. Sub-section 1 of section 91 is a new provision, further carrying out the provisions of section 81, and sub-sections 2 and 3 correspond with section 58 of the Act of 1869, substituting the Board of Trade for the Comptroller in Bankruptcy.

REVIEWS.

DECISIONS OF SIR GEORGE JESSEL.

ANALYSIS AND DIGEST OF THE DECISIONS OF SIR GEORGE JESSEL, LATE MASTER OF THE ROLLS, WITH FULL NOTES, REFERENCES, AND COMMENTS, AND COPIOUS INDEX. By APSLEY PETRE PETER, Solicitor. Stevens & Sons.

The judgments of the late Master of the Rolls contain so much valuable matter that no work founded upon them could be without some utility. They are not, however, well suited for the treatment to which they have been subjected by Mr. Peter. Admirably concise, they cannot be compressed without a sacrifice of logical connection, and it is generally impossible to extract passages which do not suffer more or less by the loss of their context.

Mr. Peter's *modus operandi* was, as he tells us in his preface, "to set out and analyze the reasons as given in all important cases affecting principles, and to refer, in the notes and comments, to useful analogous decisions." He takes the cases "in order of date," or, rather, in the order in which they are reported in a certain series of reports, and attempts, sometimes not unsuccessfully, to boil down the judgment to a highly concentrated essence. To such a mode of treatment there are several obvious objections, the most serious of which seems to us to be that the liberty thus taken with the language diminishes its authority, and it is difficult to say how much is to be attributed to the Master of the Rolls, and how much to Mr. Peter. It would have been more useful to give a full report of the leading cases decided by this great judge; or, if it were necessary to form a more or less complete collection, to arrange the cases, not in order of date, but under the headings of different subjects. This classification would have possessed an element of biographical interest, for it would have shown how wide a range of subjects was treated by the Master of the Rolls with profound learning and intimate familiarity. Those who possess no series of reports will find this volume useful, carrying them, as it does, in a cursory manner, through the most important decisions of the last ten years.

Mr. Peter has, in many instances, done his work well. The judgments, for example, in the celebrated cases of *Honywood* v. *Honywood* (22 W. R. 749, L. R. 17 Eq. 306); *Cooper* v. *Macdonald* (26 W. R. 377, L. R. 7 Ch. D. 288); and *Eager* v. *Furnivall* (29 W. R. 649, L. R. 17 Ch. D. 115), seem to us to be well rendered, and, at the same time, reduced to the smallest possible compass. On the other hand, the following brief note is the only account which is given of the important case of *Mayer* v. *Murray* (26 W. R. 690, L. R. 8 Ch. D. 424):—"Although wilful default against a mortgagee in possession, who has sold and received proceeds, has neither been alleged nor proved, yet the judgment rightly directs an account of the proceeds of sale which the mortgagee has, or, but for his wilful default, might have received." This statement is inadequate; and, moreover, tends to mislead by not containing the qualification, "but such an account does not entitle the mortgagor to question the propriety of the sale, or the adequacy of the amount for which the property has been sold."

The author apologizes for the imperfection of his work, on the ground that it was prepared "in a remote part of the country, and with only his own law library." It is to be regretted that he laboured under these disadvantages, for, if he had been able to consult more than one series of reports, he might have supplied some very serious omissions. In many cases (see, for example, *Collyer* v. *Isaacs* and *Truman* v. *Redgrave*), no references are supplied to the "authorized" series of reports. Unless, in fact, a case is reported in one particular series of reports, Mr. Peter does not, as a general rule, include it in his book. Thus we look in vain for *Couldery* v. *Bartrum* (30 W. R. 141, L. R. 19 Ch. D. 394); *Farrow* v. *Austin* (30 W. R. 50, L. R. 18 Ch. D. 58); *Smith* v. *Day* (31 W. R. 187, L. R. 21 Ch. D. 421), and other important cases too numerous to mention. Whether, towards the close of his labours, the author became somewhat less careful, or whether the reports on which he relied were defective, it is unnecessary to inquire; but, to whatever cause it is to be attributed, we find upwards of fifty cases in the 31st volume of the WEEKLY REPORTER (many of which also appear in the *Law Reports*) which ought to be included in this collection, yet are not even incidentally mentioned.

PRACTICE.

THE ANNUAL PRACTICE, 1883-4. Being a Collection of the Statutes, Orders, and Rules relating to the General Practice, Procedure, and Jurisdiction of the Chancery and Queen's Bench Divisions of the High Court of Justice. By THOMAS SNOW, HUBERT WINSTANLEY, and JOSEPH WALTON, Barristers-at-Law. Maxwell & Son; H. Sweet.

This useful work, which is virtually a second edition of the Annual Chancery Practice, 1882, forms a complete manual of practice in the High Court. It is divided into five parts, in the first of which are placed the Judicature Acts, the Appellate Jurisdiction Act, and other statutes of practical importance. Part 2, which occupies rather more than half the bulk of the volume, is devoted to the Rules of the Supreme Court; while the remaining parts comprise the orders as to court fees and stamps, the practice of the Pay Office, and the appendices to the Rules of the Supreme Court. The part of the work containing the rules is that to which, of course, most frequent reference will be made by the practitioner; and the notes to the several rules are so arranged that there is no difficulty in finding any particular subject which the reader may be in search of. For example, under ord. 58, r. 15, the note of four closely-printed pages is divided, in the first place, into Orders, Interlocutory or Final; Orders in Chambers; Calculation of Time; Refusal of Application; Extension of Time; Security for Costs—each of these headings being printed in heavy type, so as at once to catch the eye. These main divisions are further sub-divided where further analysis is requisite, and the subject-matter of the sub-division is indicated by a word or two printed in italics. Facility of reference is all-important in a book of practice, which has frequently to be consulted at times when not to find at once is as bad as not to find at all. The index appears to be well constructed, and the convenience of the book is increased by a table showing the new rules which correspond to those recently abrogated, to the Consolidated and General Orders of the Court of Chancery, and to the Admiralty Rules.

The book contains so much really valuable matter that it is almost ungracious to ask for more; yet we think that the rules and forms under the Conveyancing and Settled Land Acts might have been added without unduly enlarging its size. The notes, so far as we have tested them, seem to fulfil the promise of the authors, that "all the decisions upon points of practice up to the end of Trinity Term, 1883, have been noted."

One omission, indeed, must be noticed, under ord. 43, r. 1, where the authors state, "As to seizure of goods and chattels under a writ of *elegit*, which is now seldom used for such a purpose: see *Ex parte Abbott*, 15 Ch. D. 447." They ought, of course, to have pointed out that, by virtue of section 146 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883 (some sections of which they print), a writ of *elegit* will, after January 1, 1884, no longer extend to goods and chattels.

STATUTES.

THE STATUTES OF PRACTICAL UTILITY PASSED IN THE SESSION OF 1883, ARRANGED IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER WITH NOTES, IN CONTINUATION OF CHITTY'S STATUTES. By J. M. LELY, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. H. Sweet; Stevens & Sons.

This useful work presents the usual features. Of the statutes comprised in the volume the Bankruptcy Act has, probably, the largest number of notes, and the Patents Act the fewest. The notes we have examined are terse and accurate. We need hardly point out the convenience to the practitioner of having, at his elbow, the statutes of the last session arranged according to subject, in a handy form, and most of them prefaced by an analysis of the contents.

There are, says the *Times*, few more remarkable instances of successful voluntary organization than that furnished by the Incorporated Law Society. Sixty years ago, the solicitors of England and Wales had no cohesion as a profession, no means of indicating the general opinion of the body on any subject. Now the influence of the council in all projects of law reform is distinctly recognized by the Ministry and leading lawyers of the day, and it is no secret that two of the most notable Acts for abolishing legal technicalities—the Conveyancing and the Settled Land Acts—owe their origin to the address of a president of the society. It was natural, therefore, that the position which the society had made for itself should be recognized by the Sovereign on the occasion of an event of conspicuous interest to the profession; at the opening of the Law Courts, the president of the Law Society, equally with the treasurers of the four Inns of Court, received the honour of knighthood.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883.

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—What does the expression, "including legal incidental expenses" mean, as used in the 145th section of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883?

Where the levy is for less than £20, but the sheriff's fees and expenses bring it over that amount, does the execution come under the section? HARVEY.

January 4.

[The second question asked by our correspondent does not appear to be open to much doubt, when the decisions under section 87 of the Act of 1869 are considered. The words of that section are, "Where the goods of any trader have been taken in execution in respect of a judgment for a sum exceeding £50, and sold," &c. The question of construction which arose on that section was whether the £50 had reference to the *execution* or to the *judgment*, and it was decided, in *Ex parte Liverpool Loan Company, Re Bullen* (L. R. 7 Ch. 732), that it had reference to the execution, and, therefore, where a judgment for less than £50 had been entered up, and execution was issued for the judgment, *plus* costs of execution, which made the amount over £50, that was a case within the section. This was carried still further in *Ex parte Sims, Re Grubb* (L. R. 4 Ch. D. 521, and 5 Ch. D. 375), and *Ex parte Lithgow, Re Fenton* (L. R. 10 Ch. D. 169), where possession-money was required to be added to the amount indorsed on the writ of execution. The words of section 145 of the new Act do not admit of the doubt which was raised on the words of section 87 of the Act of 1869, as the word judgment does not appear at all in the new section. The words are, "Where the sheriff sells the goods of a debtor under an execution for a sum exceeding £20 (including legal incidental expenses), the sale shall," &c. It is clear, therefore, that if the amount indorsed on the writ of execution is for more than £20, even though the judgment may be signed for less, it is within the section.

Then comes the question asked by our correspondent, What is the meaning of "legal incidental expenses"? We think it is clear that those words were inserted for the express purpose of including the sheriff's fees and expenses, if any, in addition to the amount indorsed on the warrant, as in the cases of *Ex parte Sims* and *Ex parte Lithgow*, and that if the sheriff sells for more than £20, however the amount may be made up, the sale must be by public auction under the section. —ED. *S. J.*]

THE NEW AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS ACT—HOW FAR CAN IT BE EXCLUDED?

[*To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.*]

Sir,—I should regard with dismay your conclusion that a tenant may agree not to make any improvement without consent, were I not convinced that it is thoroughly unsound. An agreement *by virtue of* which a tenant is deprived of his right to claim compensation under the Act, where he has made any of the improvements mentioned in the first schedule, is declared void by section 55.

You hold that as the right only arises where an improvement has been effected, it will not arise at all if care be taken that no improvement shall be made, since a man cannot be deprived of a right which has never arisen; and you refer to the test laid down by Mr. Justice Field in *Lamb* v. *Brewster* (L. R. 4 Q. B. D., at p. 224)—viz., has the statute provided that the contract is illegal? That case decided that an agreement by the landlord to repay the tenant the landlord's property tax if the tenant refrained from deducting it from his rent was valid: on the mere merits, therefore, the case is significantly inapposite for your contention; for the agreement, instead of defeating, substantially accomplished the object of the enactment, which was to saddle on the landlord the ultimate burden of the tax.

But your agreement does not deprive of compensation; it only paralyses the arm that would earn it! The general right given by the 1st section and the first schedule is a right to ocmpensation for —*e.g.*, "*Improvements to which consent of landlord is not required*" (Part III. of the first schedule), where a tenant has made any improvement of that class. Surely that gives the tenant the right to make those improvements without consulting his landlord, and the right to compensation if he does make them. The 55th section makes the right to claim compensation inalienable. An agreement therefore which deprives the tenant of the right to make the improvements independently of the landlord, deprives him of a right expressly conferred, and which, if exercised, would yield compensation. Therefore, to deprive him of the right to do the work is tantamount to depriving him of the right to claim compensation, and contravenes the express language of the statute.

> "You take my house, when you do take the prop
> That doth sustain my house: you take my life
> When you do take the means whereby I live."

The 5th section describes the sort of agreement that *will* hold water—namely, one which "secures to the tenant for any improvement mentioned in the third part of the first schedule, . . . *fair and reasonable compensation*," and such compensation is to be "deemed to be substituted for compensation under this Act."

See what an anomaly would result. Under the 2nd section, a tenant who has made improvements mentioned in the third part of the first schedule within the last ten years may be entitled to compensation, of which he cannot be deprived; and he has been virtually free to make them without the moral pressure of bargainings with his landlord; but for, say, the next ten years, the case is to be very different.

In fact, if you are right, then, as to the portion of the new enactment now under discussion, the great blot in the Act of 1875—that it was permissive—is repeated in the present "professedly compulsory" statute, as Mr. Jeudwine terms it, which, however, is not compulsory at all, but only another backboneless permissive measure, if it can be defeated in the way suggested. The snowstorm of notices excluding the Act of 1875—to quote Mr. Shaw-Lefevre's simile the other day—lasted for two months from its commencement, as regards current tenancies affected; and what, then, took the place of the notices as regards the tenancies beginning after its commencement? Why, just such agreements as you declare can now be made under the new Act. I shall be much surprised if it should prove that our legislators have profited so ill by former experience. H.

Carlisle.

[(1) Our correspondent's reference to the heading of Part III. of the first schedule, "Improvements to which consent of landlord is not required," as giving to the tenant an absolute right to execute, and obtain compensation for, the improvements mentioned in that part without consulting the landlord, is ingenious, but he must be not a little hard driven to resort to such an argument. Of course, the meaning of the heading is, "Improvements to which consent of landland is not required *by this Act*." How can a statement that the consent of the landlord is not expressly required by the Act be construed as an enactment that it shall be unlawful for landlord and tenant to agree that such consent shall be required?

(2) It seems to be necessary to state again that our contention is that, according to the rule laid down by Mr. Justice Field in *Lamb* v. *Brewster* (L. R. 4 Q. B. D., at p. 224), the question whether a contract is illegal under a statute depends on "the positive language used in the statute. . . . Before we can make out that a contract is illegal under a statute we must make out distinctly that the statute has provided that it shall be so." Now our correspondent will not adhere to this rule. He insists on reading section 55 as if it avoided "any contract made by a tenant by virtue of which he is deprived of his right to *receive* compensation." That is not what the section says; it says, "by virtue of which he is deprived of his right to *claim* compensation." His right to claim compensation is defined by section 1, under which it arises only "where a tenant *has made on his holding any improvement* comprised in the first schedule hereto." The inference is that the only contracts intended to be prohibited are contracts depriving a tenant *who has made an improvement* of compensation for it. If the Legislature had intended that the tenant should have an absolute right to make improvements and to receive compensation for them it would have expresly provided, as it did in section 4 of the Irish Land Act, 1870, that "any contract between a landlord and a tenant, whereby the tenant is prohibited from making such improvements as may be required for the suitable occupation of his holding and its due cultivation, shall be void both at law and in equity."

(3) The anomaly referred to by our correspondent is imaginary. In the one case the tenant has actually expended money in executing improvements, and is therefore indefeasibly entitled to be paid for them. In the other case the tenant need not execute improvements, and chooses to agree not to execute them; where is the anomaly?—ED. *S. J.*]

The *Albany Law Journal* says that the United States Court of Appeals has a *remanet* of probably 150 causes, and these, with the new causes, will probably swell the new calendar to 800 causes. This, our contemporary adds, is a very serious event. This court has, for twelve years, been the only court in the United States that has kept up with its business.

Replying to the toast of his health, at the annual dinner of the Birmingham Law Students' Society, on Thursday, Lord Justice Bowen, who presided, said:—He thought it ought to be known that the judges were not an entirely reactionary class of human beings, that they had no interests to serve except those of the public welfare, and that nothing was more present just now to the minds of those judges than the question—the difficult question—of re-organizing the circuits. It seemed to him that something should be done in this direction. Though he considered it essential that the forms—if they liked, the pomp and formality—of justice should be carried into every corner of the land, and that the localities for its administration could not be determined entirely by population; nevertheless, in the re-adjustment of the circuit system attention would have to be given to the demands of great centres of population like Birmingham. He also thought that equity cases ought to be tried in the country as well as in London.

THE NEW PRACTICE.

JUDGES' CHAMBERS.

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

Before BUTT, J.*

Jan. 3.—*J. Lightowler* v. *J. and T. Lightowler.*

Service of writ out of the jurisdiction—Co-defendant served in the jurisdiction—Ord. 11, r. 1 (*g*.).

This was an application for leave to serve a writ out of the jurisdiction. The action was brought for specific performance by the defendants of an agreement to convey to the plaintiff their respective interests in a partnership formerly carried on by the plaintiff and defendants. The affidavit in support of the present application alleged that the defendant, Thomas Lightowler, was now residing and carrying on business in the United States, and that a deed conveying the whole of the partnership property to the plaintiff had been tendered to him there to execute, but he declined to do so.

It was stated on behalf of the applicant that the defendant, John Lightowler, had been duly served within the jurisdiction.

BUTT, J.—The person whom it is sought to serve is resident out of the jurisdiction; and the action, as against him, is founded on a breach of contract by him out of the jurisdiction. But it is stated that John Lightowler, the other defendant, has been duly served within the jurisdiction; and, as this is a partnership matter, I think that Thomas Lightowler is a necessary or proper party to that action. Upon the affidavit being amended by inserting a statement that the writ has been issued and served upon John Lightowler within the jurisdiction, the order will be made under ord. 11, r. 1, sub-section (*g*.)

Solicitors for the plaintiff, *Emmett, Son, & Stubbs*, for *Wavell, Son, & Marshall*, Halifax.

(Before PEARSON, J.)

Jan. 9.—*Hobson* v. *Monks and another.*

Time for delivering defence—Summons under order 14—Stay of proceedings—Ord. 21, rr. 7, 8.

Time for delivering a statement of defence does not run between the time of the taking out and the hearing of a summons under order 14.

This was an appeal by the plaintiff against an order of Master Butler setting aside a judgment which had been signed by the plaintiff in default of a statement of defence and staying the action.

The action was brought by a mortgagee against mortgagors for ejectment. The writ was specially indorsed. The defendants appeared on the 17th of December, and a summons, under order 14, was issued a few days afterwards, returnable on the 29th of December. On that day, before the hearing of the summons, judgment was signed in default of a statement of defence. When the summons came on to be heard it was not gone into, judgment having been already signed. The defendants then took out a summons to set aside the judgment, and also to stay the action, on the ground that there was already an action for foreclosure of the mortgage pending in the Chancery Division. The master held that the judgment was irregularly signed, and set it aside, and stayed the action on the ground that possession of the land might be recovered in the foreclosure action.

From this order the plaintiff now appealed.

Swinfen Eady, for the plaintiff.—If this judgment was regularly signed, it can only be set aside on an affidavit of merits. It is submitted that it was regularly signed. By ord. 21, r. 7, a defendant must deliver his defence within ten days after his appearance, unless he obtains an extension of time. By rule 8, where leave has been given to a defendant to defend under order 14, he must deliver his defence within eight days after the order. That rule has no application here, as no leave to defend had been given; and the defendant was bound to deliver his defence within ten days after appearance, under rule 7, which he did not do. If the time for delivering a statement of defence will expire while a summons is pending under order 14, the proper course for the defendant to take is to apply for an extension of time. As to the other part of the order, the plaintiff could not recover possession in his foreclosure action, and this action was, therefore, necessary.

Brynmor Jones, for the defendants.—The effect of ord. 21, r. 8, is that the taking out of a summons under order 14 stays all proceedings until it is heard. As to the other part of the order, the defendants are willing to consent to the plaintiff's adding a claim for possession in his action for foreclosure, even if he cannot do so without consent.

PEARSON, J.—It seems to me that it would be an absurdity to hold that the defendant must put in a defence when the plaintiff is asking for final judgment on the ground that there is no defence. What is the use of the defendant's delivering a defence while the question is pending whether he is to be allowed to defend? My strong opinion is that when a summons is taken out under order 14 the defendant ought not to put in a defence. When the summons is heard the master can take all the circumstances into consideration, and give what time he considers necessary. As to the other part of the order, it must be set aside, as a claim for recovery of possession can only be made in a foreclosure action, if leave has been obtained to join it before the issue of the writ.

Order varied by setting aside the stay of proceedings; no costs. Liberty to restore summons under order 14.

Solicitors for the plaintiff, *Rooks & Co.*

Solicitors for the defendants, *Lousada & Emmanuel.*

* Reported by A. H. BITTLESTON, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.

DEEDS OF ASSIGNMENT FOR GENERAL BENEFIT OF CREDITORS.

THE following is the form of trusts referred to in the observations under the head of "Current Topics":—

FORM OF DEED.

This Indenture, made the day of 188 . *Between A. B.*, of, &c. (hereinafter called the Debtor), of the first part; *C. D.*, of, &c. (hereinafter called the Trustee), of the second part; and *E. F.*, of, &c., *G. H.*, of, &c., and *J. K.*, of, &c. (hereinafter called the Committee of Inspection) of the third part; and *The several persons, companies, and firms* whose names are specified in the first column of the Schedule hereunder written, being creditors of the said debtor, and all other (if any) creditors of the said debtor at the date of these presents, of whom the said trustee shall have notice before paying a dividend under the trusts hereinafter contained (all of whom are hereinafter called the creditors), of the fourth part *Witnesseth* that, in consideration of the release and discharge from the said creditors respectively to the said debtor hereinafter contained, *He*, the said debtor, *Doth* hereby [*conveyance and assignment of all the real and personal estate and effects whatsoever and wheresoever, whether in possession, reversion, remainder, or expectancy of the debtor, except property held by him upon trust for any other person, and the bedding, tools of trade, and wearing apparel of himself and family. Habendum*] *Upon trust* to sell and dispose of the said estate and effects either by public auction or private contract, and to convey and assign the same, and to collect and receive all the debts due and owing to the said debtor, with power, if the said Committee of Inspection, or a majority thereof, shall so direct, to sell the said estate and effects (including therein the said book debts), or any part thereof, to the said debtor, or to any other person or persons, upon credit and with or without security as to the said Committee of Inspection, or a majority thereof, shall seem desirable and without being responsible for any loss which may be occasioned thereby *And it is hereby declared* that the said trustee, his executors, administrators, and assigns, shall stand possessed of the proceeds of the said estate and effects and the debts so to be collected by him as aforesaid *In trust*, in the first place, to pay thereout all solicitors' and other costs, charges, and expenses which shall have been or may be incurred in and about the negotiation, preparation, and carrying out of these presents, and in the investigation of the affairs and realization and winding up of the estate and effects of the said debtor, including such remuneration to the said trustee for his services as the said Committee of Inspection, or a majority thereof, may consider reasonable, and to make any payments or allowances which would have preference or be entitled to be paid in full in case of bankruptcy, and in the next place to pay, divide, and distribute the residue of the said trust moneys unto and amongst all and every the creditors of the said debtor parties hereto of the fourth part in like manner as in bankruptcy, and by such instalments and at such times as the said Committee of Inspection, or a majority thereof, shall direct, and in case of any surplus, to pay the same to the said debtor *And this Indenture also witnesseth* that, in consideration of the promises and of the grant and assignment hereinbefore contained *Each* of them the said creditors *Doth* hereby acquit, release, and discharge the said debtor, his heirs, executors, and administrators, from all debts and sums of money now due and owing from the said debtor to the said creditors respectively, and from all actions, suits, debts, claims, and demands whatsoever which they the said creditors now have against the said debtor *Provided always* that, notwithstanding anything herein contained, any creditor, at the time of executing these presents, having any lien or security or the suretyship of any person may assent to and execute these presents, without prejudice to his rights under such lien or security or suretyship, but any creditor holding any such security upon the property or estate of the said debtor shall be entitled to dividends under the trusts of these presents on the balance only of his debt remaining after giving credit for the value of such security held by him in like manner as in bankruptcy, such value to be ascertained either by the creditor realizing his security or by agreement between him and the said trustee, or by arbitration in manner hereinafter mentioned *Provided also, and it is hereby agreed and declared*, that, if any dispute or difference shall arise in the carrying out of the trusts of these presents between the said trustee and any person claiming to be a creditor of the said debtor, and entitled to the benefit of the said trusts, the same shall be settled and disposed of by two arbitrators, one to be named by each party, or by an umpire to be chosen by such arbitrators before entering on the reference in manner provided by the Common Law Procedure Act, 1854, and all the provisions of that Act relating to references to arbitration, so far as the same are applicable, shall apply hereto. In witness, &c.,

Signed, sealed, and delivered by the said—

Signature of debtor . . . . . L.S.
Signature of trustee . . . . . L.S.
Signatures of Committee of Inspection L.S.
L.S.
L.S.

SCHEDULE OF CREDITORS.

Names and Addresses.	Amounts of Debts.	Signatures.	Seals.	Signed, sealed, and delivered in the presence of

SOCIETIES.

ASSOCIATED PROVINCIAL LAW SOCIETIES.

The following are the minutes of the proceedings at a general meeting of the above societies, held at the Law Institution, Chancery-lane, on Thursday, the 20th of December, 1883, to consider the "High Court of Justice (Continuous Sittings) Bill," and the "Supreme Court of Judicature (District Courts) Bill." Present—The following members of the Association represented as follows:—Mr. Alfred Cox in the chair; Bath Law Society, by Mr. Holland Burne; Birmingham Law Society, by Mr. Thomas Horton; Bolton Law Society, by Mr. Charles H. Holden; Bristol Law Society, by Mr. Alfred Cox; Gloucestershire Law Society, by Mr. R. Ellett; Hull Law Society, by Mr. A. H. Rollitt; Leeds Law Society, by Mr. John W. Middleton; Liverpool Law Society, by Mr. Francis D. Lowndes and Mr. C. H. Morton; Manchester Law Society, by Mr. J. F. Tweedale and Mr. John Cooper; Newcastle Law Society, by Mr. C. H. Stanton, Mr. R. Pybus, and Mr. R. S. Watson; Nottingham Law Society, by Mr. Henry Wing and Mr. H. R. Thorpe; Somersetshire Law Society, by Mr. Holland Burne.

The CHAIRMAN opened the proceedings and suggested that it would be convenient to consider the District Courts Bill and the Continuous Sittings Bill together.

This course having been agreed to—

Mr. PYBUS, of Newcastle, explained the provisions of the District Courts Bill. He criticised the reasons in favour of the Continuous Sittings Bill contained in the joint memorandum of the Liverpool and Manchester Incorporated Law Societies, and urged the members to support some scheme giving district courts together with better circuit arrangements.

Mr. COOPER, of Manchester, supported the Continuous Sittings Bill, and said that the District Courts Bill would have the effect of disentitling important places from obtaining greater assize facilities.

Mr. LOWNDES, of Liverpool, explained the provisions of the Continuous Sittings Bill. He said that the title of the Bill was misleading, inasmuch as it was not intended that the judges of the High Court should be localized in the country, but only that they should come into the country for the trial of causes when required, and remain until those causes were fairly disposed of. He undertook that effect should be given in the Bill to any suggestions of which the Associated Societies might approve.

Mr. MORTON, of Liverpool, also supported the Continuous Sittings Bill, which he described as an extended assize.

The discussion was continued by Mr. BURNE, representing the Bath and Somersetshire Law Societies, and Mr. ELLETT, of Gloucester, who were both opposed to the District Courts Bill.

Mr. MIDDLETON, of Leeds, opposed the District Courts Bill, and said that the difficulty of the Leeds Society with regard to the Continuous Sittings Bill, was that it might eventually lead to the District Courts Bill. He objected to the trial of assize causes of the better class before judges other than judges of the High Court.

Mr. H. R. THORPE, of Nottingham, said they wanted a local court able to deal with cases from £50 to £200. He was not so much concerned with the means of arriving at this result, but wished for a continuously sitting judge, and was generally in favour of the District Courts Bill.

The CHAIRMAN said that Bristol was strongly opposed to having inferior judges in the provinces.

Mr. MIDDLETON moved, and Mr. COOPER seconded, the following resolution:—"That no scheme for facilitating the administration of justice in the provinces will be acceptable to suitors or the profession which, as a leading provision, provides for the trial of causes not included within the present or any amended jurisdiction of the county courts, before judges other than judges of the High Court."

Mr. PYBUS moved, and Mr. THORPE seconded, the following amendment:—"That, in order to give greater facilities for the local administration of justice, it is desirable that district courts should be established on the principle suggested by the Supreme Court of Judicature (District Courts) Bill, 1884 (now in draft); and that there should be a re-arrangement of assize circuits, in order that the judges of the High Court of Justice may have time to try, and may only be required to try, cases of exceptional importance."

On being put to the vote the amendment was negatived. The Newcastle and Nottingham Societies voted in favour of the amendment, and the Bath, Birmingham, Bristol, Bolton, Gloucestershire, Leeds, Liverpool, Manchester, and Somersetshire Societies voted against it. The representative of the Hull Society had left the meeting.

Mr. Middleton's resolution was thereupon put to the meeting, and carried by a majority of nine to one. The Nottingham Society did not vote.

Mr. COOPER proposed, and Mr. MIDDLETON seconded, the following resolutions, which were all carried:—2. "That arrangements should be made whereby, for the trial of civil actions in all divisions of the High Court, judges of the High Court should sit in the populous commercial localities in the provinces with the same constancy and dispatch as in London, so far as the requirements of the business shall from time to time suggest, and that the creation of an intermediate grade of judges for these purposes is objectionable." 3. "That adequate arrangements should be made for the conduct of chamber business in all divisions of the High Court in the provinces as in London." 4. "That the practice and procedure in the provincial centres should be that of the High Court." 5. "That the permanent localization of judges in the provinces is objectionable." 6. "That a copy of the above resolutions be forwarded to the Lord Chancellor, with the expression of the hope that her Majesty's Government may see fit to introduce a Bill for the above purposes." Resolution No. 2 was carried by 9 to 1; resolution No. 3 was carried unanimously; resolution No. 4 was carried unanimously; resolution No. 5 was carried by 7 to 1—Bath and Somersetshire not voting; resolution No. 6 was carried without opposition—nine societies voting in its favour.

Mr. LOWNDES proposed, and Mr. COOPER seconded, the following further resolution, which was carried unanimously:—7. "That the Lord Chancellor be requested to receive a deputation from the societies concurring in the above resolutions in support thereof."

A vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the business of the meeting.

The *East Anglian Daily Times* says a telegram from Bombay announces the death of the Hon. John Marriott, Advocate-General of the Province. Mr. Marriott was a son of the late Mr. John Marriott, solicitor, of Stowmarket. He had held the post for nearly twenty-one years, and was about to retire.

At the Marylebone Police Court on Wednesday, Alexander Charles Gennari was summoned by the Incorporated Law Society for having, on the 10th of November last, wilfully and falsely pretended to be an attorney or solicitor contrary to the statute. Mr. Humphreys, solicitor, prosecuted; Mr. W. Evans, barrister, defended. Mr. Humphreys said that the prosecution was undertaken by the Law Society without any vindictive feeling, but merely because it was felt no one but a solicitor should be permitted to write letters of the kind complained of. The facts were that on the 10th of November, a Mrs. Henrietta Collins, of 23, Warwick-road, Earl's-court, received a letter from the defendant demanding the payment of £4 2s. for a dress which had been supplied to her by a Miss Kay, of 15, Norfolk-terrace, Westbourne-grove. In it he stated that in the event of the money not being paid he had instructions to take out a summons in the county court. Mrs. Collins sent 20s. on account to Miss Kay, and obtained her receipt, and on the 20th the defendant again wrote, acknowledging the amount which had been paid, and demanding the balance, with the same intimation as appeared in his first letter. Thereupon Mrs. Collins sent the money to Miss Kay, and a receipt was given for it. Payment was obtained by means of these letters, as Mrs. Collins was under the impression that they were from a solicitor, and he submitted that no one but a solicitor should be allowed to correspond in that form. Mrs. Collins gave evidence in corroboration of this statement. In cross-examination she said that nothing was demanded or paid in respect of costs. Miss Catherine Kay deposed that, having been unable to obtain payment from Mrs. Collins, for goods supplied, she asked the defendant to write the letters in question. She was of opinion that she would not have got the money unless they had been written. In cross-examination, the witness said that the defendant was her cousin, and that she had no other relation who could act for her in the matter. He received no monetary consideration whatever from her. If the money had not been paid she would certainly have taken out the summons as threatened. Mr. Evans, for the defence, said that an entire explanation of the affair had been sent to the Incorporated Law Society. The defendant had merely acted as Miss Kay's agent, and the only word in the letters which could by any possibility be deemed objectionable was the word "instructions." That word, he urged, had ceased to be the exclusive property of solicitors, and he did not believe that the Act of Parliament ever contemplated that its mere use should be an offence. The fact that Mrs. Collins sent the money direct to Miss Kay showed that she did not believe the letters came from a solicitor, but that they were written merely by her agent. Mr. De Rutzen said he was of opinion that there was nothing in these letters to show that the defendant pretended to be a solicitor or attorney, although they were certainly calculated to mislead the reader into the belief that a solicitor wrote them. He thought that the case was not made out, and therefore the summons would be dismissed without costs. Mr. Humphreys asked the learned magistrate to fix the amount of recognizances he would require in the event of his being asked to state a case. Mr. De Rutzen said he should require recognizances in £40. As, however, an appeal was to be made, he should allow £5 5s. costs, which, no doubt, the Incorporated Law Society would not feel.

LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

December 18, 1883.—The following question formed the subject for discussion—"Was the decision of the Court of Appeal in the case of *Phillips* v. *Homfray* (49 L. T. N. S. 5) wrong?" Mr. T. W. Williams opened the question in the affirmative, and received support from Messrs. Baker, Hobbs, and Slater, while Messrs. Windus, Hill, Boswell, Elmslie, Austin, and Metcalfe opposed. On the usual vote being taken, after the discussion had closed, the question was negatived by a majority of two votes.

January 8, 1884.—Before proceeding to the debate, the secretary read his report for the first quarter of the session, which was of a most satisfactory description. Thirty-seven new members have been elected since the commencement of the session, and the total number of members now on the roll is 313. The average attendance has been thirty-two, and the average length of the meetings has been two hours and a half. A comparison of these statistics with those of the corresponding quarter of the last session shows that the society is in a most flourishing condition, while the debates have been full of interest and have been conducted with great spirit. Mr. J. W. Ellis introduced the question—"Is it desirable to extend the principle of the Factory Acts to assistants in shops?" which he opened in the negative. Messrs. J. Brandon, Lithiby, and Hobbs followed on the same side, while Messrs. Todd, Arnold, Austin, Lloyd Jones, Stewart Smith, and Ross advocated the affirmative. After the opener had replied, a division took place, which resulted in a majority of one for the affirmative.

OBITUARY.

MR. THOMAS WILDMAN BARKER.

Mr. Thomas Wildman Barker, solicitor, of Southport, was killed by a tramway accident at Wigan, on the 29th ult., the steam car in which he was travelling coming into collision with another steam car. Mr. Barker was born at Kirkby Lonsdale in 1833, and he served his articles in the office of the late Mr. Eastham, of Clitheroe, where he was for a short time a fellow-clerk with the late Sir John Holker. He was admitted a solicitor in 1858, and had since practised at Southport with great success. He was for many years deputy-coroner for the West Derby Division of Lancashire, and in the autumn of 1882 he was elected coroner for the division. Mr. Barker was an assessor for the borough of Southport, and he was local solicitor for the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company. He became a widower a few months ago, and he leaves a large family. He wa sburied at Preston Patrick on the 2nd inst. Mr. Barker had discharged the duties of coroner for a very populous district with great ability, and his death is universally deplored.

MR. CHARLES WILLIAM WILLIAMS.

Mr. Charles William Williams, solicitor (of the firm of Duignan, Lewis, Williams, & Elliott), of Walsall and Wednesbury, died at his residence at the former place, on the 29th ult., from a spinal affection, combined with a disease of the lungs, after a long illness. Mr. Williams was born in 1839. About nine years ago he joined the firm of Duignan & Lewis, and he had since carried on a large business at Walsall and Wednesbury. He was at the time of his death in partnership with Mr. William Henry Duignan, Mr. Lauriston Winterbotham Lewis (the clerk to the Walsall Board of Guardians), and Mr. Gerald Dibon Elliott. Mr. Williams was a very able county court advocate, and had conducted a large number of arbitrations at Walsall and Wednesbury under the Artizans' Dwellings Acts. His early death is much lamented in the neighbourhood.

MR. CHARLES WILLIAM GARROD.

Mr. Charles William Garrod, solicitor and notary, died at Wells on the 5th inst. Mr. Garrod was born in 1837. He was admitted a solicitor in 1860, and he had ever since practised at Wells. He was a notary public and a perpetual commissioner for Somersetshire, and he was treasurer for the city of Wells, and registrar of the Wells District Probate Registry of the High Court. Mr. Garrod also held several important ecclesiastical appointments, being secretary to the Bishop of Bath and Wells, and apparitor-general for the diocese, registrar of the Archdeaconry of Bath, deputy-registrar of the Archdeaconry of Wells, chapter clerk of Wells Cathedral, and registrar to the dean and chapter. Mr. Garrod was well versed in ecclesiastical law, and had long enjoyed the confidence of the bishop and many of the leading clergy of the diocese.

On Tuesday, says the *Times*, a meeting of the creditors of Mr. Savile A. Tucker, solicitor, of Cambridge-house, High-road, Lee, Kent, took place at the Greenwich County Court, before Mr. Charles Pitt Taylor, the registrar. Much excitement has been caused recently by the disappearance of the debtor, who, it is believed, has absconded to Spain. He has taken large amounts of trust money with him, and the liabilities are estimated at £50,000; assets, £3,000.

LEGAL APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. Thomas William Mallam, solicitor, of Oxford, has been appointed Clerk to the Magistrates for that city, to act jointly with his father, Mr. Thomas Mallam. Mr. Mallam, jun., is an M.A. of Exeter College, Oxford. He was admitted a solicitor in 1880.

Mr. Patrick Cumin, barrister, has been appointed Secretary to the Education Department. Mr. Cumin was educated at Balliol College, Oxford, where he graduated third class in mathematics in 1845. He was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Trinity Term, 1855, and he formerly practised in the Court of Chancery. He has been for some time counsel and assistant secretary to the Education Department.

Mr. John Eden Hiron, solicitor, of Shipston-on-Stour, has been elected Clerk to the Shipston Board of Guardians, Assessment Committee, and Rural Sanitary Authority, and Superintendent Registrar for the Shipston District, in succession to his father, the late Mr. Thomas Eden Hiron.

Mr. Thomas Stephen Edwards, solicitor, of Newport and Abercarne, has been appointed Clerk to the Risca School Board. Mr. Edwards was admitted a solicitor in 1882.

Mr. Walter Grover, solicitor, of Hemel Hempstead, has been unanimously elected Coroner for the Hemel Hempstead District of Hertfordshire, in succession to Mr. Henry Day, deceased. Mr. Grover was admitted a solicitor in 1865. He is in partnership with his father, Mr. Charles Ehret Grover, who is clerk to the magistrates and to the Commissioners of Taxes at Hemel Hempstead.

Mr. Henry Coggan Tombs (of the firm of Kinneir & Tombs), of Swindon, Cricklade, and Wootton Bassett, has been appointed Official Receiver in Bankruptcy for the Swindon District. Mr. Tombs was admitted a solicitor in 1854. His partner, Mr. Henry Kinneir, is clerk to the county magistrates at Cricklade, and to the Swindon School Board.

Mr. John David Davies, solicitor (of the firm of Davies & Jenkins), of Llanidloes, has been appointed Official Receiver in Bankruptcy for the Newtown District. Mr. Davies was admitted a solicitor in 1874. He is town clerk of Llanidloes and clerk to the borough and county magistrates.

Mr. John Jackson Sudbury, solicitor (of the firm of Clark, Sudbury, Williams, & Green), of Hereford and Ludlow, has been appointed Official Receiver in Bankruptcy for the Stafford, Shrewsbury, and Madeley Districts. Mr. Sudbury was admitted a solicitor in 1869.

Mr. Frank Evans, of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, has been appointed by the Chartered Accountants' Students' Society of London to deliver a Course of Lectures on the Law of Companies.

Mr. Alfred Ewen, solicitor (of the firm of Ewen & Roberts), of 75, Chancery-lane, and Luton, has been appointed Official Receiver in Bankruptcy for the Luton, Hertford, and St. Albans Districts. Mr. Ewen was admitted a solicitor in 1875.

Mr. Edward Albert Stone has been appointed a Puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of the Colony of Western Australia.

Mr. Henry Garencieres Pearson, solicitor and notary, of Barrow-in-Furness, has been appointed Official Receiver in Bankruptcy for the Barrow District. Mr. Pearson was admitted a solicitor in 1870.

Mr. Thomas Whitehead, solicitor, of Preston, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. Edward Percy Jobson, solicitor (of the firm of Robinson, Watts, & Jobson), of Dudley, Stourbridge, and Amblecote, has been appointed Official Receiver in Bankruptcy for the Dudley District. Mr. Jobson was admitted a solicitor in 1878. His partner, Mr. Robert Jack Watts, is one of the coroners for Staffordshire.

DISSOLUTIONS OF PARTNERSHIPS.

Henry Hawkesley Capes and Horatio Richmond Dix, solicitors (Capes & Dix), Boroughbridge. Dec. 31.

Richard Ellis, Richard Sidney Ellis, and William John Crossfield, solicitors (Ellis, Son, & Crossfield), 16, Mark-lane, London. Dec. 31.

Alfred John Keary, David John Stokes, and Frederick Hastings Goldney, solicitors (Keary, Stokes, & Goldney), Chippenham. Jan. 1. The said Alfred John Keary and David John Stokes will continue the practice under the style of Keary & Stokes.

John Charles Parkinson, John William Thompson, and Joseph Hess, solicitors, Liverpool. Dec. 31. So far as regards the said John William Thompson. The said John Charles Parkinson and Joseph Hess will continue the practice at the same address under the style of Parkinson & Hess.

Edward Shippey and John Field, solicitors (Shippey & Field), Manchester. Dec. 31. Edward Shippey will continue to carry on business at 15, Cooper-street, Manchester. John Field will carry on business on his own account at Duchy-chambers, 2, Clarence-street, Albert-square.

Thomas Norman Wightwick, Montague Kingsford, William Norman Wightwick, and Cecil Edward Kingsford, solicitors (Wightwick, Kingsford, Wightwick, & Kingsford), Canterbury. Dec. 31. So far as concerns the said Thomas Norman Wightwick. Montague Kingsford, William Norman Wightwick, and Cecil Edward Kingsford will continue the practice upon their own account.

R. Winder and Thomas H. Winder, solicitors (R. & T. H. Winder), Bolton. Dec. 31. Each partner will continue business on his own account. [*Gazette*, Jan. 4.]

JOHN CHARLES BURGOYNE, ROBERT MILNES, MONTAGU THOMAS BURGOYNE, RAYMOND HENRY THRUPP, and ROBERT BURGOYNE, solicitors (Burgoynes, Milnes, Burgoyne, & Thrupp; also Burgoynes, Milnes, Thrupp, & Burgoyne), 356, Oxford-street. Dec. 31. [*Gazette*, Jan. 8.]

MR. DANIEL, Q.C., ON THE NEW BANKRUPTCY ACT.

THE judge of the Bradford County Court (Mr. W. T. S. Daniel, Q.C.), on taking his seat in that court on Tuesday morning, said that, as it was the first day of his sitting in bankruptcy since the new Bankruptcy Act came into operation, it might, perhaps, be of use for him to make some observations upon the Act, as he thought it to be applicable to the proceedings of that court. After an interesting sketch of the origin and results of the Act of 1869, his Honour remarked that the first matter to which he had directed his attention was whether he could give any useful direction as to the conduct of the public examination. The Act required, and the rules required it also, that the public examination of a debtor, which was to precede his right to go through the turnstile, was to be in open court, and, unless otherwise ordered, public examination would be before the judge himself. By the 99th section of the Act, it would be found that the registrars were empowered to take the public examination. By the rules, it would be found that the judge had power to authorize the registrar to do any of the acts which were mentioned in the various letters *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, *e*, and *f* of sub-section 2 of section 99, and one of these acts was to take the public examination. His Honour said that he had communicated with Mr. Garnett-Orme [the registrar] on the subject, and he found that Mr. Garnett-Orme was willing to act. There was no power under the Act now to delegate authority. The powers of the judge were regulated by Act of Parliament, and the powers of the registrars were regulated by Act of Parliament; and the registrars did not act now as delegates of the judge. But there was power by the rules for the judge to authorize the registrar to do that which the 99th section empowered the registrar to do if the judge did not intervene, and, therefore, he had arranged with Mr. Garnett-Orme that the public examination should take place before the registrar—either before Mr. Garnett-Orme or Mr. Lee, whoever it might be. In making that direction, he was not dealing with what was speculative or imaginary. He was dealing with what his experience in that court showed had occurred, and might occur again. Under the Act any creditor, who had proved or tendered a proof under section 17, sub-section 4, or his representative authorized in writing, might question the debtor concerning his affairs and the causes of his failure. The representative was not required to be a solicitor. The representative might be anyone whom the creditor thought proper to appoint. There was a latent danger in the possibility of a representative being appointed who was not a professional man, over whom the court could execise a direct control, and he observed here that the right of the creditor or his representative to appear at the examination was limited to the affairs and causes of his failure. The power of the official receiver extended to the debtor's conduct, dealings, and property. His Honour said that he had drawn attention to this because he had had occasion, even under the limited powers of examination under the Bankruptcy Act of 1869, to find that when a creditor had intervened, the creditor had always felt that he had a grievance against the debtor, and matters had been gone into which he had felt it his duty to stop in the interests of justice. It had occurred to him that very possibly under this public examination—which was, as far as the official receiver was concerned, to inquire into the conduct of the debtor—an angry creditor, represented by an injudicious agent, might introduce or claim a right to put questions which he would say would bear upon the causes of the failure and the debtor's affairs, but which questions would be oppressive, and in those cases he had suggested to Mr. Garnett-Orme that if suggestions were not attended to by the parties representing such creditors he should on his own authority adjourn the examination to be heard before his Honour, because a judge would always be able to exercise a stronger authority when exercising a power properly than could be expected to be exercised by a registrar. He made these remarks for the guidance of solicitors, and he thought that mode of conducting the examination would relieve this court, in the exercise of its county court jurisdiction and other bankruptcy jurisdiction, from what, if absolutely necessary, would probably interfere with the other duties which the judge had to discharge. There might be difficulties as to the mode of conducting this examination which at present he was unable to fathom. The debtor had to be examined on oath, and his duty was to answer all questions which the court might ask and might deem fit to be asked, and his replies were to be taken down. His Honour did not exactly see in what way the notes were to be taken if not by shorthand; and if taken by shorthand, of course the notes must be written, and then, as they had to be signed by the debtor, there must be an interval of time during which the notes might be read over by the debtor and signed by him. There might be cases in which it might be exceedingly difficult to carry into effect the precise provisions of that clause, but when the difficulty arose it must be dealt with in the best manner possible. It might be necessary to suggest among the practitioners of the court some mode by which the method of taking notes of the examination might be arranged and agreed upon.

The mistake in the Act of 1869, so far as procedure was concerned, was this: it assumed that all debtors were honest and that all creditors were honest. It was an admirable system for honest men, but unfortunately what was sufficient to enable honest men to settle their difficulties turned out wholly insufficient for persons of a different character, and as a consequence the evils which had flowed from the Act of 1869 in assuming all debtors and creditors to be honest had been to let in a body of persons who might be described as wreckers. He hoped that would effectually be put a stop to by the provisions of this Act. On looking through the Act he had asked himself the question—and he did not see the answer to it, How was it to be brought into operation for the benefit of creditors? Legislation could not alter human nature. It assumed that all the debtors were alike. All debtors were not alike. We could not make equality, either in goodness or in badness. There were three classes of debtors, his experience showed him. There was the dishonest debtor; there was the improvident debtor who was not dishonest; and there was the unfortunate debtor. These three distinct classes required three distinct modes of treatment. Now, he looked to see how this Act could be brought into operation for the benefit of creditors. It was hardly to be expected that a dishonest debtor would himself file a petition, make himself bankrupt, and bring himself within the power of the official receiver. There was a class of debtors who, knowing themselves insolvent, without committing any act of bankruptcy or making their proceedings notorious, quietly realized their property. Some perhaps had honesty enough to pay a few of their creditors, others paid none at all, but, having realized their property, went, and no act of bankruptcy was committed until they were gone. Then how was the creditor to put this Act into operation? Under the Act of 1869 he could have served the debtor with a notice of payment within seven days, and on the eighth, in default of payment, there would have been an act of bankruptcy. Now no creditor could serve a notice in bankruptcy until he had got final judgment in an action. Suppose the case of a dishonest debtor, realizing his property quietly, and a creditor wanting to make him bankrupt, that creditor had to bring an action against him. That gave the debtor at least nine days to get off to America in; but the debtors, such was the ingenuity of practitioners, were found to make illusory affidavits, and cases had occurred in which a clever practitioner had delayed the signing of the judgment till the debtor had got right off. With reference to the improvident debtor, if he were honest he would be expected to file a petition himself, but he might be persuaded to commit an act of bankruptcy and file a petition of insolvency. But if not, then the creditor was in the same position under this Act as he was with the dishonest debtor. He could not get the power of making such a debtor bankrupt unless he were able to sign final judgment in an action. That feature of the case appeared to his Honour to throw very considerable difficulty in the way of creditors getting the benefit of this Act in cases in which the debtor was either dishonest or improvident. In reference to the unfortunate debtor, he should consider that the unfortunate debtor—that was, the man who would be unable to pay 20s. in the pound, and was brought into this position by circumstances beyond his control—would represent fifty out of the hundred of debtors, and he would divide the other fifty between the dishonest debtors and the improvident debtors. With regard to the unfortunate debtors there would be probably no difficulty. The question, perhaps, might be one of expense. This Act contained provisions for small bankruptcies. The rules provided that in every case £5 was to be deposited for the purposes of the official receiver, and in every case, also, £5 was to be paid for the stamps on the petition presented, and if the petition were presented by a solicitor, the solicitor's costs were to be added. In a small bankruptcy was it to be expected that some £15 was to be forthcoming for the machinery of this Act to be put in motion? Looking at the point in a practical light, he very much doubted that, in these small estates, £5 to the official receiver, £5 for the stamp, and what the solicitor had a right to, requiring a deposit for his legitimate expenses, would ever be forthcoming. He feared that the expense of administration in these small bankruptcies would be prohibitory. In the cases of other bankruptcies it would give creditors the opportunity of considering how far it was wise to avail themselves of the provisions of the Act. He had pointed out these difficulties because they were not imaginary. He could only say that, although he felt his power was very much less to do good under this Act than it was under the Act of 1869, nothing should be wanting on his part to give effect to the provisions of the Act so as to make them as far as he possibly could beneficial for creditors. Another observation his Honour wished to make was that the public paid nothing for this investigation into the conduct of the debtor. All the costs of the investigation came out of the estate. In other words, the creditors had to pay in the shape of a diminished dividend, and that was a matter which was not unworthy of consideration. The estate was already a deficient estate, and the public honesty required that there should be this public examination. Probably some means might be found of exonerating the estate from some portion of the expense at least which was involved in the appointment of the official receiver. There was another point. The powers of the Act under the 162nd section enabled the Board of Trade to get very large sums of money into the Bank of England, but these were trust moneys, they had owners, and by changing the place of deposit and by changing the character of the depositor one did not change the character of the fund. It still remained trust fund, and he apprehended that every facility would be given for enabling the parties who were interested in those funds when the funds got into the Bank of England to get them out on a proper application, or else it would be an act of injustice, because the moneys which had been left outstanding in banks at Bradford, not being capable of being applied but being reserved for dividends for creditors who had not come forward, were all trust moneys, which remained trust moneys when they got into the Bank of England, and he did not know whether he was presumptuous in making the suggestion that moneys so paid out of the Bank of England should be carried each to a separate account, so that the creditors of each estate might know what stood to the credit of that estate, and form a judgment whether it was worth their while to apply to have the funds distributed amongst them.

COURT PAPERS.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.		Court of Appeal.	V. C. Bacon.	Mr. Justice Kay.
Monday, Jan.	14	Mr. Teesdale	Mr. Clowes	Mr. King
Tuesday	15	Farrer	Koe	Merivale
Wednesday	16	Teesdale	Clowes	King
Thursday	17	Farrer	Koe	Merivale
Friday	18	Teesdale	Clowes	King
Saturday	19	Farrer	Koe	Merivale
		Mr. Justice Chitty.	Mr. Justice North.	Mr. Justice Pearson.
Monday, Jan.	14	Mr. Pemberton	Mr. Jackson	Mr. Lavie
Tuesday	15	Ward	Cobby	Carrington
Wednesday	16	Pemberton	Jackson	Lavie
Thursday	17	Ward	Cobby	Carrington
Friday	18	Pemberton	Jackson	Lavie
Saturday	19	Ward	Cobby	Carrington

HILARY SITTINGS, 1884.

COURT OF APPEAL.

Appeal Court, II.

Final and interlocutory appeals from the Chancery, and Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Divisions (Probate and Divorce), the London Bankruptcy Court, and the County Palatine and Stannaries Courts.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Friday, Jan 11 — App. mots. ex pte—orgl. mots—and apps from ordrs made on interlocutory mots
Satrday .. 12.. Interlocutory apps contind
Monday 14
Tuesday.... 15 — Apps. from the general list.
Wednes .... 16 — App. motns. ex pte—orgl. mots—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory mots (separate list), & also apps from general list if required
Thursday ..17.. Apps from the general list.
Friday..... 18 — Bkcy apps and also apps from general list if required
Satrdy..... 19
Monday 21
Tuesday .... 22 — Apps. from the general list
Wednes .... 23 — App. mots. ex pte—orgl. mots—and apps from ords. made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and also apps from general list if required.
Thursday ..24.. Apps. from the general list.
Friday..... 25 — Bkcy appe & also apps from general list if required
Sat., ... 26
Monday.... 28
Tues., ... 29 — Apps. from the general list.
Wednes .... 30 — App. motns. ex pte—orgl. mots—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory mots (sep list) & also apps. from general list if required.
Thursday ..31.. Apps from the general list.
Friday, Feb. 1 — Bkcy. apps. & also apps from general list if requ rd
Saturday .. 2
Monday .. 4
Tues. ..... 5 — Apps from the general list.
Wednes .... 6 — App. motns. ex pte—orgnl. mots.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and also apps. from general list if required.
Thursday .. 7.. Apps from the general list
Friday, ... 8 — Bkcy apps & also apps from general list if required.
Sat., ... 9
Monday 11
Tuesdy.... 12 — Apps from the general list
Wednesday 13 — App. motns. ex pte—orgl. mots—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory mots (separate list), & also apps. from general list if required
Thursday ..14.. Apps from the general list
Friday .... 15 — Bkcy. apps. and also apps. from general list if required
Saturday ..16
Monday ... 18
Tuesday.... 19 — Apps from the general list
Wednesday 20 — App. motns. ex pte—orgl. mots.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory mots (separate list), & also apps. from general list if required
Thursday.. 21.. Apps from the general list
Friday .... 22 — Bankcy apps. & also apps. from general list. if required

N.B.—Lunacy Petitions are taken in Appeal Court II., on every Saturday at half-past ten during the Sittings.

Appeal Court, I.

Final and interlocutory appeals from the Queen's Bench Division, and from the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division (Admiralty).

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Friday, Jan 11 — App. mots. ex pte.—orgl. mots.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory mots
Sat., ... 12.. Interlocutory apps contind.
Monday 14
Tuesday.... 15 — Apps. from the general list
Wed. ..... 16 — App. mots. ex pte.—orgl. mots.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory mots & also apps. from general list if required
Thursday ..17
Friday 18
Saturday ..19
Monday 21
Tuesday.... 22 — Apps. from the general list.
Wed ..... 23 — App. mots. ex pte—orgl. mots—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory mots and also apps. from general list if required.
Thursy ..24
Friday 25
Saturday ..26
Monday, ..28
Tuesday.... 29 — Apps from the general list.
Wednday ..30 — App. mots. ex pte—orgl. mots.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory mots and also apps from general list if required.
Thursday ...31
Friday, Feb 1
Saturday .. 2
Monday.... 4
Tuesday.. .. 5 — Apps. from the general list.
Wednesday, 6 — App. motns. ex pte—orgl. mots.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory mots and also app. from general list if required.
Thursday .. 7
Friday 8
Sat. 9
Monday.... 11
Tuesday.... 12 — Apps. from the general list
Wednesday 13 — App motns ex pte—orgnl. mots.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory mots and also apps. from general list if required.
Thursday ..14
Friday 15
Saturday ..16
Monday 18
Tuesday ..19 — Apps. from the general list.
Wednesday 20 — App. motns. ex pte—orgnl mots.—and apps. from ords made on interlocutory mots and also apps. from general list if required.
Thur. 21
Friday .... 22 — Apps from the general list.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

CHANCERY DIVISION.

Chancery Court, I.

V.C. SIR JAMES BACON.

Friday, Jan 11...Mtns, adj sumns, & gen pa
Saturday ...12..Pets., sht causes, & gen. pa.
Monday.... 14
Tuesday.... 15 — General paper.
Wednsdy ...16
Thursday ..17
Friday .... 18..Motns. adj. sums. & gen pa.
Sat. ..... 19..Pets., sht. causes & gen. pa.
Monday 21
Tuesday.... 22 — General paper.
Wednesday. 23
Thursday ..24
Friday .... 25..Motns, adj. sum. & gen. pa.
Saturday ..26..Pets., sht. caus, & gen. pa.
Monday 28
Tuesday.... 29 — General paper.
Wednesday. 30
Thurs. 31
Friday, Feb. 1..Mots. adj. sumns. & gen. pa.
Saturday .. 2..Pets. sht. causes, & gen. pa.
Monday .. 4
Tuesday.... 5 — General paper.
Wed. 6
Thursday .. 7
Friday .... 8..Mots. adj. sums. & gen. pa.
Saturday .. 9..Petns., sht. caus. & gen pa.
Monday.... 11
Tuesday.... 12 — General paper
Wednesday 13
Thursday ..14
Friday .... 15..Mtns, adj sumns & gen pa
Saturday ..16..Pets, sht causes & gen pa
Monday ...18
Tuesday ...19 — General paper
Wednesday20
Thursday ...21
Friday .... 22..Mots. Adj. sums. & gen. pa.

Further considerations will be taken as part of the general paper in priority to original causes which have not already appeared in the paper.

Any cause intended to be heard as a short cause must be so marked in the cause book at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard, and the necessary papers must be left in court with the judge's officer the day before the cause is to be put into the paper.

Chancery Court, IV.

MR. JUSTICE KAY.

Friday, Jan. 11..Mots. & adj sumns.
Saurdy .... 12..Pets., short caus., adj sums
Mond..... 14
Tues. ..... 15 — General paper (Fur cons, causes without wits)
Wednesday .16
Thursday ..17..Mots. adj sums, & gen. pa.
Friday, ... 18..Pets., adj sums, & gen. pa.
Satrdy, ... 19..Sht. caus. & adj sums.
Monday 21
Tuesday.... 22 — Gen. pa. (Causes with wits)
Wednesday 23
Thursday ..24..Motns. adj sums, & gen. pa
Friday ..... 25..Pets., adj sums., & gen. pa.
Saturday ..26..Sht. caus., & adj. sumns.
Mondays.... 28
Tuesday.... 29 — General paper (Fur. cons, causes without wits)
Wednesday 30
Thursday ..31..Mtns. & gen. pa.
Friday, Feb. 1..Petns, adj sums, & gen. pa.
Saturday .. 2..Short caus., & adj. sums.
Monday 4
Tuesday .. 5 — Gen. pa. (causes with wits)
Wed. 6
Thursday .. 7..Mots. & gen. pa.
Friday .... 8..Petns, adj sums. & gen. pa.
Saturday.... 9..Sht. caus., & adj. sums.
Monday.... 11
Tuesday.... 12 — General paper (Fur. cons, causes without wits)
Wednesday 13
Thursday ..14..Mtns & gen. paper.
Friday .... 15..Pets., adj sums., & gen. pa.
Saturday ..76..Sht. caus., & adj sums.
Monday.... 18
Tuesday.... 19 — Gen. pa. (causes with wits)
Wednesday 20
Tuesday ..21..Mtns. adj sums, & gen. pa.
Friday .... 22..Pets. adj sums. & gen. pa.

Any cause intended to be heard as a short cause must be so marked in the cause book at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard, and the necessary papers must be left in court with the judge's officer the day before the cause is to be put into the paper.

Chancery Court, III.

MR. JUSTICE CHITTY.

Friday, Jan 11..Motns. & non-wits list
Satday .... 12 — Pets, sht. caus, adj. sumns (Procedure), & non wts list
Monday.... 14..Fur cons & non wts list
Tuesday.... 15 — Causes without witnesses, adjourned summs, and special cases
Wednesdy ..16
Thursday ..17
Friday .... 18..Motions and non wts list
Saturday ..19 — Pets, sht. caus, adj., summs. (Procedure), & non wts list
Monday .... 21..Fur con and non wts list
Tuesday.... 22 — Causes without witnesses, adjd summonses, and sp cases
Wednesday.. 23
Thursd 24
Friday ..... 25..Motns. & non wts list
Sat., ... 26 — Pets., sht. caus., adj. sums, (Procedure) & non wts list
Monday.... 28..Fur cons & non wts list
Tuesday ..29 — Causes with wits
Wednes. 30
Thursd 31
Friday, Feb. 1...Mots. & non wts list
Saturday .. 2 — Pets.,Sht. causes,adj. sums. (procedure), & non wts list
Monday.... 4..Fur cons & non wts list
Tuesday .. 5 — Causes with wits
Wednesday 6
Thursday .. 7
Friday .... 8..Motns. & non wts list
Saturday.... 9 — Pets., sht. caus., adj. sums. (Procedure), & non wts list
Monday ..11..Fur cons & non wts list
Tuesday.... 12 — Causes with wits
Wed., ... 13
Thursday ..14
Friday .... 15..Motions and non wts list
Saturday ..16 — Pets., sht. caus. adj. sums. (Procedure), & non wts list
Monday .... 18..Fur cons & non wts list
Tuesday .... 19 — Causes without wits, adjd sumns and spec cases
Wednesday 20
Thur 21
Friday .... 22..Motions & non wts list

Any cause intended to be heard as a short cause must be so marked in the cause book at least one clear day before the same can be put in the paper to be so heard, and the necessary papers must be left in court with the judge's officer the day before the cause is to be put into the paper.

Chancery Court, II.

MR. JUSTICE NORTH.

N.B.—During Mr. Justice North's absence on Winter Circuit the business of his lordship's court will be proceeded with by a Judge from the Queen's Bench Division.

Friday, Jan 11 — General paper.
Saturday ..12
Mond., ... 14
Tuesday.... 15 — General paper.
Wednesday.16
Thurs 17
Friday 18
Saturday ..19
Monday .... 21 — General paper.
Tuesday ..22
Wednesday 23
Thursday ..24
Friday 25
Saturday ..26
Monday.... 28 — General paper.
Tuesdy, ... 29
Wednsdy..... 30
Thursday ..31
Friday...Feb. 1
Saturday .. 2 — General paper.
Monday 4
Tuesday .. 5
Wed., ... 6
Thursday .. 7
Friday 8
Saturday .. 9 — General paper.
Monday.... 11
Tuesday ..12
Wed., ... 13
Thursday..14
Friday, ... 15
Saturday ..16 — General paper.
Monday 18
Tuesday.... 19
Wednesday 20
Thursday... 21
Friday..... 22 — General paper.

Lord Chancellor's Court.

MR. JUSTICE PEARSON.

Friday, Jan 11...Motns. & adj. sums.
Saturday ..12..Sht. caus, pets. adj. sumns.
Mond., ... 14
Tuesday.... 15 — General paper.
Wednesday 16
Thursday.. 17
Friday, ... 18 .Motns., & adj. sums
Saturday ..19..Sht. caus., ptns. adj.sumns.
Monday 21
Tuesday.... 22 — General paper
Wednesday 23
Thursday .. 24
Friday ..... 25..Motns. & adj. sum.
Saturday ..26..Sht. caus, pets., adj. sumns.
Monday 28
Tuesday ..29 — General paper.
Wednesday 30
Thursday .. 31
Friday...Feb 1..Motns. & adj. sum.
Saturday .. 2..Sht. caus., pets., adj. sumns.
Mond 4
Tues. ..... 5 — General paper.
Wed, ... 6
Thursday .. 7
Friday .... 8..Mots. & adj. sumns
Saturday.... 9..Sht. caus, pets. adj. sumns.
Monday 11
Tuesday.... 12 — General paper.
Wed., ... 13
Thursday ..14
Friday .... 15..Motns. & adj. sums.
Saturday ..16..Sht. caus., petns, adj. sumns.
Monday 18
Tuesday ..19 — General paper.
Wednesday 20
Thursday ..21
Friday .... 22..Mtns, & adj sumns

COURT OF APPEAL.

HILARY SITTINGS, 1884.

LIST OF APPEALS FOR HEARING.

(Set down to Saturday, 5th January, inclusive.)

APPEALS FROM THE CHANCERY DIVISION, THE PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY DIVISION (PROBATE AND DIVORCE), AND THE COUNTY PALATINE AND STANNARIES COURTS.

General List.

1883.

Mackintosh v Chalmers appl of pltffs from V C Bacon Feb 8
Corbett v Plowden appl of pltffs from Baron Pollock for Mr Justice Pearson Feb 10
In re T Boddington, decd Boddington v Clairat appl of pltffs from Mr Justice Fry Feb 12
Penfold v Stromeyer appl of deft from V C Bacon Feb 13
In re John Brier, decd Brier v Evison appl of defts from Mr Justice Chitty Feb 16
In re The Milan Tramways Co ld & Co.'s Acts appl of Official Liquidator from Mr. Justice Kay Feb 19
In re The Quartz Hill Consolidated Gold Mining Co ld & Co's Acts appl of Alfred Tucker from V C Bacon Feb 21
Robinson v Archibald appl of deft from Mr Justice Fry Feb 22
Stott v Milne appl of pltff from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster Feb 23
The Northern Counties of England Fire Insurance Co ld v Whipp appl of pltff Co from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster Feb 23
In re The Met Brush Electric Light and Power Co ld & Co's Acts appl of B Ollendorff from Mr. Justice Chitty Feb 26
Games v Bonnor appl of deft from Mr Justice Pearson Feb 26
Warren v Le Marchant appl of pltff from Mr. Justice Kay Feb 27
Knell v Walker appl of pltff from Baron Pollock for Mr Justice Pearson March 1
Hart v Hobbs appl of pltff from Baron Pollock for Mr Justice Pearson March 2
In re J H Cameron, decd Nixon v Cameron appl of Louisa Cameron from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster March 2
Gill v Woodfin appl of deft from V C Bacon March 3
France v Clarke appl of deft W G Quihampton from Mr Justice Fry March 5
In re The Quartz Hill Consolidated Gold Mining Co ld and Co's Acts (Young's Case) appl of R. Young from Mr Justice Pearson March 5 (Security ordered April 3)
The Auvergne Bituminous Rock & Paving Co limd v Churchward appl of defts Foster and anr from Mr Justice Fry March 5
In re The International Financial Society ld and reduced and Co's Acts appl of P F Strousberg from Mr Justice Fry March 7 (Security ordered March 13)
In re The Phœnix Chemical Works ld & Co's Acts appl of C T Gilbert from Mr Justice Chitty March 7
In re The Sumburgh Mining Co ld & Co's Acts appl of Wm Oliver from Mr Justice Chitty March 10
Holyland v Lewin appl of deft from Mr Justice Chitty March 13
In re Sanderson, decd Wright v Sanderson appl of pltff from so much of decree of Sir James Hannen as pronounces for probate of codicil March 13
Strickland v Symonds appl of pltff from Mr Justice Pearson March 14
Gibbings v Strong appl of deft Burbidge from Mr Justice Kay March 21
Bloxam & anr v Favre & ors appl of pltffs from judgt of Sir James Hannen overruling demr to defence and pronouncing against validity of paper writing March 28
In re Thomas Harrald decd Wilde v Walford appl of pltffs from Mr Justice Fry March 28
McWean v McNaughtan appl of pltff from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster March 28
In re Chancellor decd Chancellor v Brown appl of pltff from Mr Justice Chitty March 30
Bayly v Great Western Ry Co appl of pltff from Mr Justice Chitty March 30
In re the Deptford Creek Bridge Co & Thos Beavan—contract for sale—V and P Act 1874 appl of Deptford Creek Bridge Co from Mr Justice Chitty March 31
Boots v Snelling appl of pltff from Baron Pollock for Mr Justice Pearson April 2
Jones v Graham & anr appl of deft J Fildes from Mr Justice Kay April 2
Kettlewell v Watson appl of G Roberts and ors from Mr. Justice Fry April 5 (to come on with Padgett's appeal when reached).
In re The Gold Co. of Southern India limd & Co's Acts appl of E F K Fortescue from Mr Justice Kay April 5
Bobonfield v Spooner appl of T Davis & anr from Baron Pollock for Mr Justice Pearson April 5
Peacock v Sinclair appl of defts from Mr Justice Chitty April 7
In re The Butler's Wharf Co ld & Co's Acts Anderson v Butler's Wharf Co ld appl of the Liquidator from V C Hall April 13
Thomas v Williams appl of pltffs from V C Bacon April 13
In re R L Bolton, decd, Hulley v Bolton app of F G Bolton and ors from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster April 16
Harvey v Municipal Permanent Investment Building Society app of pltf from Baron Pollock for Mr Justice Pearson April 16
Cropper v Smith app of defts from Mr Justice Pearson April 18
In re J F Rowlands, decd, Meakin v Rowlands app of defts from Mr Justice Fry April 19
Bertutton v Jaquet app of deft E Ould from Mr Justice Pearson April 20
Jackson v Welstenholme app of pltf from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster April 24
Ormes v Bateman app of defts from Mr Justice Pearson April 24
In re Foskett, decd, Waller v Foskett app of pltf from Mr Justice Kay April 24
In re R W Walford and T Hussey—Contract—V & P Act, 1874 app of T Hussey from V C Bacon April 25
Cutler v Selby app of deft T R Selby from order of the late Master of the Rolls dated Dec 2, 1880 (set down by order) April 26
In re Griffiths, decd, Griffiths v Lewis app of deft from Mr Justice Chitty April 27
Kettlewell v Watson app of deft J Padgett from Mr Justice Fry April 28
In re The Baada and Kirwee Booty, Kinloch v The Queen and Secretary of State for India app of the Rev Alfred Kinloch from Mr Justice Kay April 30
Green v Humphreys app of deft from Baron Pollock for Mr Justice Pearson May 3
In re The Devon and Cornwall Light and Power Co ld appl of the Hon F W Cadogan from Mr Justice Chitty May 5
Howe v Smith appl of pltffs from Mr Justice Kay May 7
Sutton v Sutton appl of deft from Mr Justice Chitty May 8
Wicksteed v Biggs appl of defts from Mr Justice Pearson May 8
In re Wake's Settlemt and 10 & 11 Vict c 96 app of H W Burt from Mr Justice Fry May 10
Barker & ors v Beevor appl of pltffs from V C Hall allowing demr May 22—Security ordered June 6
Smith v Darlow (Walter Wilson elt) appl of Wm Roundell late Sheriff of Yorks from Mr Justice Chitty May 23
Sheppard & anr v Hovell & ors appl of L P Ballard widow from Mr Justice Chitty disallowing claim May 24
Ward v Sittingbourne and Sheerness Ry Co appl of pltff from order of Mr Justice Chitty on fur con May 25
In re Saml Taylor decd Illsley v Randall appl of S T. Fraser & anr from Mr Justice Pearson May 31
Spraggett v Spraggett and ors appl of W Newton and anr from Mr Justice Pearson May 31
Kensit v The Great Eastern Ry Co appl of plts from the judgt of Baron Pollock for Mr Justice Pearson June 5
Morgan v Scott app of deft from part of judgt of V C Bacon June 11
In re Lewis Solomon decd Levy v Jacobs app of H Hart from Mr Justice Kay June 12
In re J Stafford Sons & Oswin's trade mark, No 28,413 and Trade Marks Registration Act, 1875 app of Messrs. Allen & Ginter & ors from V C Bacon on app from order of registrar June 13
In re John Smith decd Hooper v Smith app of plts from order of V C Bacon on fur con June 16—Security ordered Aug 8
In re Estates at Swansea, settled by will of C R Jones and S E Act 1882 app of Henry de la Dillwyn from V C Bacon June 18
In re The Dronfield Silkstone Coal Co ld & Co's Acts app of Messrs Overend & Barker & ors from Mr Justice Chitty June 19
Boswell v Coaks appl of Pltffs from judgt of Mr Justice Fry June 19
In re The Brighton Livery Stables Co ld & Co's Acts (exparte Joseph Offord) appl of Joseph Offord (a Contributory) from V C Bacon June 19
Bulteel & anr v Grepe & ors Grepe & ors v Loam appl of John Stanley Grepe from judgt of V C Hall June 21
In re The Gt Wheal Polgooth limd & Co's Acts (165th Sec) and In re Charles Turner a Solicitor appl of Official Liquidator from refusal of V C Bacon June 26
Oldrieve v Knowles (C B Nash's claim) appl of Claimant from Mr Justice Chitty June 26—Security ordered July 25
Barlow v Vestry of St Mary Abbotts Kensington appl of Deft Vestry from V C Bacon June 28
Love v Leay appl of Plt from judgt of Mr Justice Cave for Mr Justice Chitty June 28—Security ordered Nov 2
In re W James decd James v James appl of Deft from V C Bacon June 29
Ritson v Harrison Harrison v Ritson appl of Deft Rooke Pennington from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster June 30
In re a Contract for Sale between Ellen Hadfield & Thomas Pryce Joyce (Stretford Lancaster)—V & P Act 1874 & Lancaster Acts 1850 & 1851 appl of Ellen Hadfield from V C of County Palatine of Lancaster setting aside objections July 2
Ada Howarth Ptnr v James Walch Howarth Respt appl of Respt from decree nisi for dissolution of marriage pronounced by Mr Justice Butt dated May 30 July 3
Smyth-Pigott v Smyth-Pigott appl of Deft E F Smyth-Pigott from judgt of Mr Justice Fry July 4
In re James Truman, decd, Dawbarn v Truman appl of plts from judgt of Mr. Justice Chitty July 4
Henriche v Westinghouse app of plt in person from refusal of Mr Justice Kay July 7
In re The Colorado Mines Development Co, limd, and Co's Acts app of Robert Tennant from Mr Justice Kay July 11
In re T E March, decd, Mander v Harris app of plt from order of Mr Justice Chitty allowing demurrer July 11
Espir v Mainwaring app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Pearson July 12
In re Charles Augustus Wright, a solicitor (expte Jerome Sassone and anr appl of Mr Wright from Mr Justice Chitty July 13
In re The Northern Counties of England Fire Insce Co, limd, and In re Robt Gilliatt an alleged Contributory and Co's Acts app of Robt Gilliatt from Mr Justice Chitty July 14
In re Bentley-Innes, deceased Bentley-Innes v Bentley-Innes app of R C Millar from Mr Justice North July 14
In re The London Fish Market and the National Fishery Co, limd, and Co's Acts app of E R Suffling and ors from refusal of Mr Justice Chitty to make winding-up order July 17
Nordon v Nordon app of deft Maurice Nordon from Mr Justice Chitty July 20
In re the Ooregum Gold Mining Co of India, limd and Co's Acts app of James Wilson from Mr Justice Chitty dismissing Petn to wind up Co July 21
In re T B Illidge, decd Davidson v Illidge app of Henry Staple from refusal of Mr Justice Chitty July 21
In re T B Illidge, decd Davidson v Illidge app of T B Illidge from Mr. Justice Chitty July 21
In re The Artistic Colour Printing Co, limd, and Co's Acts (Chappell's Case) app of Liquidator from refusal of Mr Justice Chitty July 25
Rust v The Victoria Graving Dock Co app of the Victoria Graving Dock Co from Mr Justice Field for Mr Justice Kay July 25
Rust v The Victoria Graving Dock Co app of London & St Katharine Dock Co. from Mr Justice Field for Mr Justice Kay July 25
Norton & Eccles, on behalf, &c v Compton (Piper's Claim) appl of H E Piper from refusal of Mr Justice Pearson July 25
In re The General Financial Bank limd & Co's Acts (Richardson's Case) appl of Joseph Richardson from V C Bacon July 27
In re The White Star Consolidated Gold Mining Co limd and Co's Acts appl of Edward Brewis from winding-up order made by V C Bacon Aug 2
Jones and anr v The Great Eastern Ry Co appl of deft from judgt of V C Bacon Aug 2

In re The North Wales Freehold Copper Mines & Smelting Co limd appl of David Downing from Mr Justice North Aug 2
In re a Contract for Sale between Charles Adams and the Vestry of St Mary Abbots, Kensington and V & P Act 1874 appl of Charles Adams from Mr Justice Pearson Aug 3
In re The Alliance Socy (in Voluntary Liquidation) & Co's Act, 1862 appl of H C Godfray from Mr Justice Kay Aug 3
Hemberow v Frost appl of deft from judgt of V C Bacon Aug 3
Hotchkiss v Gardener Gun Co appl of pltff from judgt of Mr Justice Denman for Mr Justice North Aug 4
In re Susan Brown decd O'Halloran v King appl of pltffs from Mr Justice Kay Aug 7
Hayn v Gardener appl of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Denman for Mr Justice North and notice of contention by pltff Aug 10
Leyland and Co v Vaughan (Liverpool D R) appl of pltffs from judgt of Baron Pollock for Mr. Justice Chitty Aug 10
The 110th Star-Bowkett Benefit Building Society v Chapman app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Fry Aug 11
In re Joseph Timperon, decd and of money standing to the credit of certain Ry Cos—"The account of parties entitled in remainder" app of Richard Gauss and ors from V C Bacon Aug 13
In re J H Bell, decd Lake v Bell app of J B Parker from Mr Justice Chitty disallowing creditors' claim Aug 13
In re The Cornwall Minerals Ry Co and Co's Act 1867 (Claim of Newquay and Cornwall Junction Ry Co) app of the Newquay, &c, Co from Mr Justice Kay dismissing claim Aug 13
In re John Maddever, decd Three Towns Bkg Co limd v Maddever app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice North at trial Aug 13
In re Contract between John Mordy and W B Cowman for Sale of Freehold Property in Cumberland & V & P Act, 1874 app of W B Cowman from Mr Justice Chitty Aug 13
In re The North Wales Freehold Copper Mines and Smelting Co ld and Co's Acts app of R. M. Fabris from Mr Justice North Aug 14
Smith v Land and House Property Corporation, limd app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Denman for Mr Justice North Aug 15
Alt v Norman app of defts from judgt of Mr Justice North Aug 17
In re a Contract for sale of Real Estate between George William Nugent and William Riley and V & P Act, 1874 app of G W Nugent from judgt of Mr Justice North Aug 17
Chattesley v Nicholls app of plt from judgt of Mr Baron Pollock for Mr Justice Pearson Aug 21
Charlton v Rolleston, and In re Swindon, Marlboro' and Andover Ry Acts, 1873 and 1879 and Lands Clauses Acts, 1845 and 1849 app of Swindon, &c Ry Co from order of Mr Justice Kay Aug 23

FROM THE QUEEN'S BENCH AND PROBATE, DIVORCE, AND ADMIRALTY (ADMIRALTY) DIVISIONS.

For Judgment.

Jacobs, Marcus & Co. v Credit Lyonnaise London Agency appl of Deft from Justices Denman and Manisty overruling demurrer (c a v Nov 9, present Master of Rolls and Lord Justice Bowen)
Burdick and ors v Sewell appl of Pltff from judgt of Mr Justice Field after trial in London (c a v Nov 27, present Master of Rolls and Lords Justices Baggallay and Bowen)
Svensden & ors, Owners of the Trygvason v Wallace Bros. appl of Deft from judgt of Mr Justice Lopes after trial in London (c a v Dec 17, present Master of Rolls and Lords Justices Baggallay and Bowen)

For Hearing.

1882.

Salberg, Bros & Co v Moore appl of Pltffs from the Lord Chief Justice and Lord Justice Brett (sitting as a Divisional Court) setting aside verdict obtained in Shoreditch County Court Aug 18

1883.

May v Jacobs appl of Defts from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at trial at Lewes Feb 5 part heard Nov 21, present, Master of Rolls and Lords Justices Baggallay and Bowen (S O restore when facts agreed on)
Stock v Inglis appl from judgt of Mr Justice Field at trial at Westminster with special jury Feb 27 (to stand out of Paper until mentioned by Counsel, by order)
The Silver Hill Mining Co v Bridge appl of Pltffs from judgt of Mr Justice Grove on claim and counter claim at trial at Bristol March 14
The Mayor, &c., of the Borough of Salford v Clowes appl of Deft from judgt of Mr Justice Watkin Williams after trial at Manchester April 11 (part heard Dec 21, present, Master of Rolls and Lords Justices Baggallay and Bowen)
Hancock v Hale appl of Pltff from judgt of Mr Justice Cave at trial in Middlesex April 11
Rees v Quénerdu Aîné appl of Deft from judgt of the Master of the Rolls at trial at Glamorgan April 13
Whalley v The Lancashire and Yorkshire Ry Co appl of Deft from judgt of Mr Justice Day at trial in Lancashire April 13
The Widnes Metal Co v The Elliott's Metal Co ld appl of Defts from judgt of Mr Justice Kay at trial without a jury at Liverpool April 19
Hawley v Lee appl of Deft from Mr Justice Kay at trial at Liverpool April 25
Action remitted to County Court Crowther v Thorley appl of Pltff from Justices Grove and A L Smith reversing judgt of Huddersfield County Court for Pltff May 1
The Sea Insurance Co ld v Hadden & anr appl of Pltffs from judgt of Mr Justice Day after trial at Liverpool May 1
On English Information and Answers Attorney-Gen v Hubbuck and anr appl of Defts from decree of Barons Pollock and Huddlestone and Mr Justice North May 4
Gibbs & ors Great Western Railway Co appl of pltffs from judgt of Justices Field & Mathew on appl from County Court May 8
Hutchinson v Woodhams (sued, &c) appl of pltff from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew allowing deft's demr to whole claim May 9
The London & North Western Railway Co v Ivens appl of deft from judgt of Justices Watkin Williams & Mathew on special case May 9
The Queen on the Prosecution of the Southborough Burial Board v The Overseers of the parish of Tunbridge appl of prosecutors from judgt of Justices Field & Mathew on special case refusing mandamus May 9
Shoolbred v Hindle app of plt from Justices Grove and Smith setting aside verdict and directing entry of judgt for deft Hindle action tried by Mr. Justice Kay at Manchester May 12
Shoolbred v Hindle and anr app of deft Broadbent from judgt of Justices Grove and A L Smith May 21
Coombe v Cook app of deft from judgt of Baron Huddleston at trial in Middlesex May 17
Henwood v Boursot app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Manisty after trial in London May 21
(Public Health Act 1875 s 269 subs 7) Dyson & ors v The Greetland Local Board app of Dyson and ors from Justices Field and Mathew declaring rate valid May 25
Whitworth v Page app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Day at trial at Liverpool June 5
The Athenry & Ennis Junction Ry Co v The Waterford and Limerick Ry Co app of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Field at trial in Middlesex June 7
Higham & ors v The Failsworth Industrial Co-operative Society limd app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Day at trial in Manchester June 7
Cooper v Davis app of plt from Baron Pollock and Mr Justice Lopes setting aside verdict and judgt—action tried by Mr Justice Williams at Liverpool June 7
Nordenfeldt v Gardener & ors app of defts from judgt of Baron Huddleston at trial in Middlesex June 12
Davies v Paul and ors (action commenced in High Court, remitted and tried in Brompton County Court) app of plt from Justices Williams and A L Smith reversing judgment of County Court June 14
Gulliohsen v Stewart Bros app of deft from order of Baron Pollock and Mr Justice Lopes on sp c June 15
Miller v Fletcher Falconer & Co app of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at trial in London June 18
Burroughes & anr v The London Financial Association ld app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Day at trial in London June 22
Evans & anr v Soames & Co app of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Day at trial at Liverpool June 27
Hollins & Co v Verney Bart & ors app of defts from the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Denman and Manisty June 29
Reeves v Adie (Chas Edwd Barlow claimant) QB Crown Side app of plt from judgt of Justices Williams and Stephen on app from county court June 30
Edington & Sons v Maddison & Co app of plts from Justices Grove and Stephen setting aside verdict and directing judgt for defts July 2
Dye v Dye & anr app of plt from Baron Pollock and Mr Justice Lopes directing entry of judgt for defts on special case stated by parties July 3
Noy & ors v Bush app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at trial in Middlesex (transferred from the Chancery Division) July 7
Christie v Barker (Q B Crown Side) app of deft from judgt of Justices Williams and A L Smith dismissing app July 7
Andrews (Trustee) Wild & ors appl of pltff from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at trial in London July 9
Sir W H Dyke, Bart v Cammell app of deft from judgt of Justices Williams and A L Smith for plt on findings of Official Referee July 9
Haines v Haines app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Day at trial in Middlesex July 10
Brunsden v Humphreys app of plt from ord of Baron Pollock and Mr Justice Lopes July 12
Vogel & Co v The Electrical Power Storage Co app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Hawkins at trial in London July 12
Howes v Prudential Assurance Co, limd, and Howes app of deft Howes from judgt of Mr Justice Lopes after trial in Middlesex July 13
Needham and anr v Johnson and Co app of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Lopes at trial in Middlesex July 13
Chapman v Newson app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Stephen at trial in Middlesex July 14
Ebbetts and anr v Booth (No 2) app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Stephen at trial in Middlesex July 16 1882—E—1,564
Watkin v Newcomen app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Day at trial in Middlesex July 16
Equity side of County Court Jolliffe v Baker (Q B Crown Side) app of plts from Justices Williams and A L Smith reversing decision of County Court Judge as to misdescription of property July 16
The Queen v The Overseers of the Poor of Middlesborough Township (Q B Crown Side) appl of defts from Justices Williams and A L Smith affirming liability to rate July 17
The Queen v The Overseers of the Poor of Linthorpe (Q B Crown Side) appl of defts from Justice Williams and A L Smith affirming liability to rate July 17
Mackintosh v Steward app of dft from judgt of Sir James Hannen and Mr Justice Field signed 1st Aug, 1882, under order of July 24, 1882 July 18
The Queen v Illingworth (Q B Crown Side) app of Prosecutors from Justices Williams and A L Smith reversing order of Sessions July 20
Blott v Smith app of dft from judgt of Baron Huddleston at trial at Bedford July 20
Pocock and ors v. Gillham app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at trial in Middlesex without a jury transferred from Chancery Division by General Order of May 14, 1883 July 25
Thomas v London, Brighton & South Coast Ry Co and ors app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Stephen at trial in London July 25
Fisher v London & South-Western Ry Co app of plt from judgt of Baron Pollock and Mr Justice Lopes on special case July 26
The School Board for London v Wright (Q B Crown Side) app of plts from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice and Justices Denman and Manisty on appeal from County Court July 31
Jenkinson v Rothery and ors app of dft Stevenson from judgt of Mr Justice Williams at trial July 31
Addison v Pether and Son app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew at trial in Middlesex Aug 1
Ship Winston Owners of the Warwick Castle v Owners of the Winston appl of pltffs from judgt of the President Aug 2 (without Assessors)
The Queen v The Assessment Committee of the Poplar Union (In re Bromley and St Leonards Supplemental List—Q B Crown Side)
The Queen v The same Committee (In re All Saints, Poplar, Supplemental List app of the East and West India Dock Co (Prosecutors) from judgt of Mr Justices Grove and Manisty in each case quashing order of Assessment Session) Aug 3

Jenkinson v Rothery and ors app of dfts Rothery, Mankwell, and Spencer from judgt of Mr Justice Williams after trial at Leeds Aug 3
M'donald v Tacquah Gold Mines Co limd app of dfts from judgt of Lord Justice Baggallay at trial at Maidstone and Hertford Aug 3
Bolden v The Mayor, Aldermen and Burgesses of the Borough of Oldham appl of pltf from judgt of Mr Justice Williams after trial at Liverpool Aug 4
Jones and anr v The Mayor, &c., of the Borough of Oldham appl of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Williams at trial at Liverpool Aug 4
Dorman v Goodchild and ors appl of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Stephen on Referee's report Aug 4
Ship Notting Hill Cloak & ors The Owners of the Notting Hill appl of pltffs from order of the President overruling objections to Registrar's report Aug 4
The Queen v The Guardians of the Poor of the Parish of St Marylebone, Middlesex (Q B Crown Side) appl of defts from judgt of Justices Williams and A. L. Smith confirming order of Justices and Sessions on case stated Aug 11
Garrold v Hollings appl of deft from Justices Field and Williams reviving Exchequer judgt obtained in 1869 with liberty to issue execution Aug 11
Brown v Briggs appl of plt from judgt of Mr. Justice Stephen at trial in Middlesex Aug 14
Lazzard v Gilmour app of deft from judgt of Lord Justice Lindley at trial at Swansea Aug 21
Barton v Daniels app of plt from Baron Pollock and Mr Justice Lopes confming order giving liberty to set off judgt in anr action Aug 23
Daniels v Barton and anr app of deft Barton from Baron Pollock and Mr Justice Lopes reversing Master's order setting aside judgt Aug 27
Mitchell v Smith app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice Cave at trial at Leeds Aug 30

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

CHANCERY DIVISION.

HILARY SITTINGS, 1884.

Causes for trial or hearing.

(Set down to Saturday, January 5th, inclusive.)

N.B.—During the absence of Mr Justice NORTH on the Winter Circuit the Business of his Lordship's Court will be taken by a Judge from the Queen's Bench Division.

N.B.—The order in which the Business will be taken by the several Judges of the Chancery Division will be found particularly stated in the Hilary Sittings Paper, and will also appear in shorter form in the Daily Cause List.

Before Vice-Chancellor BACON.

Causes for Trial (with witnesses and without witnesses).

In re Holmes Wright v Weatherhead Weatherhead v Wright point of law on counter claim
Hardy v Wilmot act wits pt hd
Pile v Lewis act wits
Pile v Willis act wits
In re Lemm, Hewartson v Lemm act

Transferred from Mr. Justice Fry, and Mr. Justice Chitty, by order dated February 22nd, 1883.

In re M E Anstie, Chetwynd v Morgan act & m f j
London Financial Assocn v Kelk act, wits pt hd
Winter v Ind Coope & Co act wits
Stamford &c Bkg Co v Graves act wits
Manchester Val de Travers Co v Slagg act wits
Marshall v Reynolds act wits pt hd
Fane v Dalton act wits
Lamplough v Sykes act wits
Downs v Downs act
Hugenin v Lindsay act wits
Natl Provincial Bank of England v Lithgo a & m f j wits
Arnold v Arnold act & m f j
Best v Best act & m f j

Set down since Transfer.

Barro ny Stirrup act
In re R Moir, Warner v Moir act m f j
Matthews v Matthews act
Brown v Black act wits
In re M Morrison, Jeffcot v Duncan act
Wingfield v King-Church act wits
In re T O Lomax, Whitehead v Lomax act
Phillips v Phillips m f j
Blomfield v Blomfield act wits
In re Cottman Kelland v Gilbert act wits
Balcombe v Sawtell act
Wood v Silcock act wits
London Metal Co v Oakley act wits
London Metal Co v Oliver act wits
London Metal Co v Norman act wits
Matthews v Wilson m f j
Turner v Smalpage act
In re Booth, Bradford &c Bank v Booth act
Bougiovanni v La Société Genera'e act wits
Carr v French & Monks m f j
In re Adams, Greenwood v Adams act
In re Mitford, Burgess v Mitford act wits
Smith v Silicate Paint Co act wits
Hawes v Hawes act & m f j wits
Stuckey's Bank v Southcombe act wits
In re J Highmore act wits
Peat v Barne act wits
Epsom v Phillips, act wits
In re T Jarratt Jarratt v Jarratt act wits
Perkins v Farmer act wits
Scratton v Scratton act wits
In re E P Toulmin Dwyer v. Bond m f j
Meakin v Walsh act wits
Green v Balls act & counter claim
Hunter v Barnes act
Probert v Windus act wits
Gudgeon v Hall act
Jarratt v Jarratt act wits
Jarratt v Jarratt act wits
In re Todd Davies v Davies f c
Hipgrave v Case act wits
In re R Whitehouse Clarke v Shilton act
In re W Yeatman Mulberry v Ward Smith v Mulberry act wits
Crisp v City of London Publishing Co act
Gwatkin v Westover act
Pennethorne v Henderson act & m f j
Thuey v Dennis act wits
Ayling v Mercer act wits
Woodroffe v Puttman cntr-clm
Dean v Archer act wits
Williams v Lond S Wales &c Co ld a wits
Goodall v Goodall act wits
Humphreys v Boot & Son act wits
In re Gallop United Ports &c v Gallop act & m f j wits
Phelps, Stokes & Co v Comber act wits
Clothworkers' Co v Hutchison act wits
Harvey v Olliver act wits
Davies v Davies m f j
Morgan v Barnes act
Morley v Weigel act wits
Collins v Johnston act
Bellamy v Hine act wits
Bourjeaurd v Martin act
Dew v Met Ry & District Ry Co act wits
Working Men's &c Society v Reynolds act wits
Adams v Abercrombie m f j
Pile v Pile m f j
Sankey v Williams act wits
Keber v Strachan act
Pratt v Walsh act
In re Hammond Wenn v Hammond m f j
Brewer v Brewer 2od f c
In re Williamson Williamson v Wright s c
United Telephone Co v London & Globe &c Co act wits
Adams v Abercrombie act
Blaiberg v Blundell act
In re Milne Milne v Gandy sub f c
Hudson v Crowther f c
Cole v Jones act
In re J Meyrick Hartman Gillett v Lowndes act
Caldwall v Croughton m f j (short)
Smith v Smith f c
Bickerton v Walker act & m f j
Meux & Co v Rudd act

Adjourned Summonses.

In re Agg Gardner &c and V & P Act 1874
Frost v Henberow
In re Docura Docura v Faith
Forrest v Shore
White v Ahrens & Co
Patchett v Illingworth

Before Mr. Justice KAY.

Causes for Trial (with witnesses.)

Ingold v Powell act pt hd
Wear v Johnson act
King v Lucas act
Martin v Collyer act
Cosbey v Watson act
In re Stainer Stainer v Joyce act
Nicksinson v Meredith act
Young v Ker act
Scholes v Webb act
Blackman v Blackman act
New Centrifugal Creamer Co v Hald & Co act
In re Marsden Gibbs v Layland act
Arnold v Hughes act & m f j
Gane v Myers act
Edwards v McClure act
Hill v Renardson act
Greening v Ince act
Cull v Gudgeon act
Mauney v Morgan act
Blair v Stock act
Surrey Commercial Dock Co v Stotesbury act
Morris v Beal act
Brady v Dove Dove v Brady act
In re G E Boyes Boyes v Carritt act
Roberts v Oppenheim act
Williams v Johnstone act
Vesa Murrhina Glass Co. limd v Hill act
Blood v Mulville act
Harwood v Blackwell Blackwell v Harwood act
Lewis v Abardare &c Co act & m f j
Wartnaby v Marriott act
Baldwin v Hargreaves act
Snow v Whitehead act
Russell v Vargues act
The Roppoltsweiler Stassencisenbahn Gesellschaft v Mulhausen Trams Co ld act
Agar v Peninsular &c Co act
Ellis v Rogers act
Usher v Hamel act
Hamel v Usher act
Meux v Lord Tweedmouth
Griffith v Equitable Reversionary Interest Socy act
Parratt v Hamp act
Re Whitworth, Whitworth v Whitworth act
Faulkner v Satterthwaite act
Ansell v Wearing act
Fellowes v Jefferies wits
Frontino, &c Gold Co v Smith act
Warner v Barnett act
Whitehaven &c Authority v Smith act
Craddock v Mansel act
Crosse v Waller act
Mayor of Plymouth v Martin act
Hearn v Glanville act
Gilroy v France act
In re Truefort Trafford v Blane act and m f j
Brereton v Richardson Ellison & Co act
Pollard v Taylor act
Briebach v Weaver act
Hunt v Aylmer, M.P. act
Foss v Avondale Paper Co ld act
Maddox v Blackman act
Gorden v Potter act
Boxall v Boxall act
Meakreth v Walmesley act
Pearson v Pearson act
In re Pearson, Pearson v Pearson
Peacock v Colling act
Fowler v Holdom act
Peterken v Hemlyn act
In re Heaton's Trade Mark &c adj summs
Gauntlett v Pulling act
Fry v Tapson act
Dawson v Matthews act
Catton v Bennett act
Jones v Smith Bros act
Harper v Bingley act
Herford v Worley act
Gilmour v Ry & Electric Appliances Co ld act
Carter & Co v St. Giles' District Board of Works act
Henderson v Andrews act
Hobbs v Orlebar act
Ivens v Ivens act
Cook v Barber act
Thompson v Smith act
Hughes v Bywater act
Star Life Assce Co v Freeman act
Levick v Statham act
Wilson v Clifton act
Stevenson Jacques & Co v Clay Lane Iron Co ld act
Goodall v Harding act

Causes for Trial without witnesses

Bacon v Camphausen act
Griffith-Boscawen v Scott act and m f j
London and Westr Loan, &c, Co v Beaumont m f j
In re J Moggridge Moggridge v Moggridge act
Lancaster Banking Co v Brogden act
Mellor v Porter m f j
Bedborough v Army & Navy Hotel ld m f j and mtn pt hd
In re Stainsby Stainsby v Stainsby act
In re Faker Faker v Chubb act
Molesworth v Benjamin act
In re Butler Butler v Huntley act
Mellor v Porter m f j
Neate v Busby m f j
In re Hives Reader v Hives act
Deighton v Alderson act
In re Brouch Sproule v Brouch sp c
Barlow v Waters m f j
In re Hobson Law v Moore m f j
Wood v Heywood m f j
In re Grayson Grayson v Spear m f j
Credit Co ld v Waddell act and m f j
Dinn v Cole act
Pilley v Martyn act
Mutual Life Assce Co v Clark m f j (short)
Lucas v Lucas m f j (short)

Adjourned Summonses

Burstall v Beyfus pt hd
In re Olive Olive v Westerman
Andrews v Brown
In re Healey New Mill Co, limd
Treherne v Dale In re Evans
Welsh v Channell
In re Williamson's Settlement
In re Grundy Schott v Grundy
In re Symons Ramsey v Symons
In re Baldock Hudson v Baldock
Neighbour v Brown
Armstrong v Henry
In re French's Trusts and 10 & 11 Vict &c
In re Bright's Settlement and S E Act
In re Heaton and Keighley Water Wks
Gibbon v Russell
Gibbon v Russell
In re Llandrindod Wells, &c, Bldg Co, limd
Holt v Holt
Chadwick v Chadwick
Collier v Chadwick
In re Hall to Hughes and V & P Act
Barrow v Smith
In re Roberts Strong v Copnall
In re Butler Huntley v Butler
In re Smith Day v Bonami

Further Considerations.

Forrer v Sidebotham f c
Andrew v Andrew f c & sums to vary
In re Mulcaster Dalston v Mulcaster f c & sums

In re Groves Barnard v Groves f c
In re Davies Roderick v Davies f c
Cust v Lady Middleton 4th f c
McDougall v Copestake f c & 2 summs
In re Solomon Levy v Jacobs f c
In re Cannon Cannon v Paddon f c
Hyett v Mekin f c pt hd
Bund v Green f c and summs
Sir R H Currie, Bart v Duffield f c
In re McCowan McCowan v McCowan f c and summs
Vanner v Chubb f c
In re Martin Hawley v Chapman f c
In re Cockerton Cockerton v Baker f c
Kirby v Fell f c
In re Paul Marris v Sawcard f c
Lusk v Denny f c
Waites v Waites f c
In re Neve Smith v Coaks f c
In re Benn Benn v Benn f c
In re McClellan McClellan v McClellan f c
Vanner v Chubb f c (short)
In re De la Cronée De la Cronée v De la Cronée f c

Before Mr. Justice CHITTY.
Causes for Trial (with witnesses).

Digby v Evans act (8 O Feb 1)
In re Jones' Trade Mark, adj sums with wits
In re The London Fish Market and Natnl Fishery Co (Witt's case) adj s with wits
In re Pritchard & Dodd's application & Messrs W Waller & Co's opposition & Trade Mark Acts adj sums with wits
Nokes v Rymer act
Berrington v Lloyd act
Jones v Robinson act
In re North, decd Sawden v Falconer act (cross exam on affidavits)
In re The Provincial Brush Electric Light and Power Co (ex pte Dick) motn for rectification of shareholders' register Dick v The Provincial, &c, Co ltd, act (not before Feb 4) down) by order
Foster v Hunt act Feb 14
Hall v Smith act
Digby v Evans act (transferred from Q B Division, by order) 8 O Feb 1
In re J Edgcombe Nicholson v Shields act
Syer v Ashby act
Monson & Co v Boehm act and summs (In re Boehm's Trade Mark) by order Jan 29
Jackson v Brown act
The Nottingham Permanent Benefit Bldg Society v New act
In re A M Blake, decd Faulconer v Mackenzie adj sums with wits, by order
Preece v Amys act
Allender v Allender act
Smallpage v Mawson act
The London Agency, limd, v The Milford Haven Ry and Estate Co, limd act Feb 1
The Earl of Lonsdale, decd West London Commercial Bank, limd, v Lowther act transferred from V C Bacon Rt Hon James Lowther v Lord Chas Ker act
Adrian v Hillhouse act
Craig v Trimin act
Holland v Watney act
Bouskell v Barnett act
Ashley v West act
Baker v Carr act
New v Langham act
Harvey v Lacey act
Brett v Sugar act
Cooper v Brown act
Cooke v Keighley act
Hunt v Mowbury act
Blott v Clark act
In re W K Bores, decd, Thompson v Stephenson act
Partington v Mullaney act
Dunn v Dunn Nunn v Dunn act & counter-claim
Broad v Cook act
In re James Schofield, decd, Whitaker v Schofield Radcliffe v Schofield act & counter-claim
Hunt v Hunt act
The York City & County Bank v The Yorkshire Banking Co limd act
Sutteridge v Thorn act
In re Jacobs, decd Longmore v Jacob act
Bowlby v Taylor act
Thomasin v Adamns act
Hull Smith & Co v Walker act
Bastendorff v Rogers act
Elsey v Bailey Elsey v Bailey cons acts
Russell v King act
Nokes v Ireland act
Bull v Saunders act
Pickering v Hopkinson & Sons act
Arnold v Wickens act
In re R. B. Barrett decd Barrett v Barrett act
Nowell v Waller Smart v Nowell act and counter-claim
Watson v The Belt Copper Mines ltd act
Philips v Philips act
Alston v Baker act
Schmitz v Cohen act
James v Hutchinson act
Perry v Met Board of Works act
Pemuefather v Elmslie act
Stenning v Fox act
Baldwin v Baker act and In re Baker's Trade Mark adj sumns
Hine v Saunders Saunders v Hine Carter v Hine act and counter-claims
Beauchamp v Campbell act
Mitchell v Bennett Bennett v Mitchell act and counter-claim
Been v Wates act
Toone v Hinckley Distr ct Local Board act
In re Johnson decd Johnson v Sly Sly v Blake act
Buckton v Bentley act
Yore v Algar act
Corpe v Philbrick Philbrick v Corpe act and counter-claim
Rowley v London Fish Market and National Fishery Co act
Marple v The same Co act
Archer v Rope act
In re Finlay decd Finlay v Clarke act
Beale v Levy act
Dodd v Macfoy act
Crowder v Charrington act

Further Considerations.

Whitty v James f c
In re George Smith decd Smith v Clutton f c
Mansel-Jones v Grey f c
In re Horner, decd Hellewell v Townsend f c
In re M Birch, decd Brightwen v Complin f c
Moore v Moore f c
Smith v Maybank f c short
In re Ward, decd Wadd v Kerdney 2nd f c
Watson v Cave Allen v Cave f c
In re Kershaw Kershaw v Banks f c

Demurrer.

Carter v Helmore dem ot defts set down by order of Dec 1

Non-witness Causes, Adjourned Summonses and Special Cases.

Morton v Hallet act pt hd
In re The Florence Land and Public Works Co. ltd (claim of Anglo-Italian Bank) adj sums
In re Cwm Avon Estate and Water Works Co (expte Shaw) adjd sums
Mitchell v Josse adj sumns
Treffry v Treffry act
In re George Perkin's Estate adj sumns
Wootton v Strudwick m f j
Price v The Bala and Festiniog Ry Co act
Gething v Keighley adj sums
In re The Wearmouth Crown Glass Co, ld, adj sums In re The Wearmouth Crown Glass Co, National, &c (bank's claim) adj sums
Westeneys v Hunter m f j
Sheldon v Andrews adj sms
Paget v Clagett act
Messum v Brown s c
Broadbent v Holdsworth s c
In re Florence Land and Public Co ld (Tufnell & Ponsonby's case) adj sums
Parish of Sutton to Church and V & P Act adj sumns
In re Greaves decd Bray v Topfield adj sums
In re J P Litchfield decd, Wallis v Litchfield act
In re The Great Britain Fire Insce Co adj sumns
In re C Whitfield's Estate, Myers v Whitfield adj sumns
In re F. E. Smith & ors adj sums
Cockell v Cockell act
In re R. W. Anderson's Trade-Mark adjd sums
In re Clay, decd Clay v Clay sp c
In re Hoskison's Estate Holmes v Hoskison adjd sums
In re Milford Haven Ry and Estate Co, ld (Week's case) adjd sums
Cotton v Kenyon sp c & m f j
Cotton v Cotton m f j
Dugdale v Burkinshaw act
Morgan v Wallingford act
De Thoren v De Thoren m f j
In re C Harper, decd, Mills, Errington, &c, Co v Harper act
In re E M Johnston, decd, Cockerell v Earl of Essex s c & m f j
Kelly v Stevens act
Palmer v Garfit s c
In re T Aston, decd, Stokes v Aston act
In re H. Niblett, decd, Langlois v Robertson act
Goddard v Knight act
In re D H Brown, a Solicitor (to review taxation) adj sumns
In re The German Date Co limd adj sumns
Morley v The Central Permt Benefit Building Society adj sumns
In re Geo Kerry's Estate Ling v Gower adj sumns
In re The Northern Counties of England Fire Insurance Co limd (Drotre) adj sumns
Liebig's Extract of Meat Co lmtd v. Anderson adj sumns to review taxn
Hughes v Faulkner act
Quarrell v Hill act
In re The Thames and Channel Steam Ship Co (Yeoman's case) adj sumns
In re Shannon to Green's Contract V & P Act adj sumns
Steedman v Steedman act
Finn v Adamson s c
Sidebotham v Sidebotham act
Yates v Yates adj sumns
In re Mid Cannock Colliery Co lmtd adj sumns
In re Jno Bagnall & Sons limd adj sumns
In re A Salmon adj sumns
In re A C Castle (for reference to taxn) adj sumns
Cole v Beasley m f j
Dauvillier v Myers (to review taxn) adj sumns
In re Addleshaw & Warburton adj
In re J Wood, decd, Adams v Eldridge s c
In re Hambro's Settled Estates adj sumns
In re D Blyth, decd, Blyth v Thomson act
Elkins v Capital Guarantee Society act
In re W Heathcote, decd, Sturgess v Aviolet s c
Kennedy v Hatley s c
In re W Mabon, decd, Slater v Mabon act
Alfree v Athill act
In re Hopkins, decd, Hopkins v Chilton adj sumns
In re Brown, decd, Brown v Walmsley act
Wills v Eyton m f j
Seago v Hetson act
In re Tapsell decd Johnson v Burfoot act
Penrice v Williams m f j upon award
In re Robinson decd Burgess v Robinson m f j
In re S Cooper decd Hall v Cooper Cooper v Hall act and cntr-clm
Manchester & Salford Bank ld v Scowcroft act
In re Perks decd Perks v Hirons s c
In re J Defries's Estate Nordon v Levy adj sums to review taxn
In re Artistic Colour Printing Co Workman's case adj sums to review taxn
In re John Appleton's Estate Barber v Tebbit adj sums
In re The Wala Wynaad &c Co(ex pte Schultz) adj sums
Snowdon Slate Quarries Co ld v Griffith act
Cozens v Palmer act
In re G H Carthew adj sums to review taxn
In re S Naylor decd Dunn & anr v Naylor m f j (short) (Birmingham)
Waddell v Parry act
Coates v Rogers act
In re Kerry's Estate Ling v Gower adj sums
In re Devon & Cornwall Electric Light & Power Co ld adj sums
Chave v Bridgwater act & m f j
Baker v Pringle pt's interpleader sums
Dalson v Lancashire Maxim Weston Electric Light Co act
Plantagenet-Harrison v Watson m f j upon specially endorsed writ
In re Lunn decd Sturgess v Lunn act
Harvey v Lambert originating summ set down by order of judge
In re Goode decd Rowe v Coulin m f j (short)
In re Morgan adjourned summs Sugg v Bray summs
Shephard v Jones act
Davies v Morgan act
In re The Westminster Hotel Co (Rhyl) ld (expte Sheen) adj summs
Benzing v Helmore m f j (short)
In re Kemp's Estate Poste v Kemp adj sumns
Pether v Halsey act
Lucas v Matthews act (Birmingham)
In re Hanson's Estate Hanson v Hanson adj sumns
Fray v Drew adj summons to vary certificate
In re Hoar's estate Wansborough v Rocoe adj summs
In re W. Evans decd Evans v Davies act
Wyer v Tomkins act and m f j
In re Peters decd Abbott v Peters m f j (short)
In re Batten decd Batten v Batten act
Hendra v Garner m f j (short)
Buckler v Huth m f j (short)
Wise v Trenholm m f j on findings of chief clerk's certificate
In re Finlay decd Wood v Rayner m f j (short)
Lonergran v Chapel House Colliery Co ld m f j (short)
In re Say's Estate Smith v Say act (short)
In re Hinds decd Stevens v Hinds act (short)
Blakey v Climax Boot Protector Co act
Calland v Darley act

Before Mr. Justice NORTH.
Causes for Trial (with witnesses).

Benham v Irvine act
Plumptree v Blaxland act
In re Corfield Carmichael-Smith v Briscoe act
In re Corfield Briscoe v Davison act
Hall v Bovey act
Taylor v Hoare act
Raimondi v Great Western Ry Co act
Sugg & Co ld v Bray & Co act
Gething v Lewis Merthyr &c Co lmd act
Cooper v Bullen act wits
Lewis Merthyr Co. v Gething act
The Callis-Bis Gold Mining Co limd v Downes act wits
Edwards v Edwards act
De Barathy v Cronsigh act
Sadler v Palmer act
Delbonille v Lamb act
Harris v Callender act
Smith v Binney act
Goupil v Gallet act
Warner v Warner act & m f j
Smith v Harris act
In re Taylor, decd Nichols v Taylor act wits
Power v London Wharfing & Warehousing Co act
Quilter v Tod-Heatly act
Bent & Buckley v Hulme act
Vaughan v Firth act
Swindell v Birmingham Syndicate lmd act
In re Stokes, Stokes v Read act
Byng v Byng act wits
Lang v Rankin act
Wintle v Ash act
Marlow v Upton act
Brooks v Middleton act
Matthews v O'Dowd act

Johnson v Massey act
Condon v Vollum act
Transferred from Mr. Justice Kay and Mr. Justice Pearson pursuant to order dated Nov 15, 1883.
Barton v Thompson act
Hills v Thompson act
Elliott v Sharp act
Woolwich Building Society v Carr act
In re S D Hearle, West of Engld &c Bk v Cock act
Hazelwood v Webster Webster v Hazelwood act
Doyle v City of Glasgow Life Assce Soc act
Parish v Poole act
Ackers v. Ackers act
Mayor, &c, of Kingston-upon-Hull v Morton act
Miller v Mawson act
Hunt v Cottee act
In re Matthews Hider v Powell act
Wilkins v Jourdain act
Fleming v Crouch act
Hardaker v. Moorhouse act
Stobbs v Kelsey act
Randall v Solicitor for Treasury act
Sanders v Jones act
Edgington v Fitzmaurice act
In re Davies Jones v Jones act
Morris v Powis act
Robertson v Sharpe act
Robinson v Milne Milne v Robinson act
Jones v Milne act
Dix v Coventry act
Payton v Saunders act
In re Gilbert Webster v Gilbert act
In re Anwyl Jones v Davies act
Barber v Harvey act
Gillig v Gillig act
Mackreth v Oddy act
Pardew v Smith act
Briggs v Briggs act
Kemble v Bodwell act & m f j
Benfield v Armson act
James v Young act
Casper v Goggs act
In re Dawkins Ingram v Chase act
Johnson v Pate act
In re Barnes Bower v Barnes act
In re Fortnum In re Lovell Hunt v Fortnum act
Crauford v Royal Exchange Assurance Corporation act
Lewin v Jones act
Litchfield v Gater act
In re A Sacre Mahoney v Sacre act
Lumsden v Young act
Stephens v Baldwin act
Cradock v Rogers act
Lovejoy v Cooke act
Priolean v Kazelack f c
Fraser v Province of Breschia Co, lmd act
Clarke v Foxley act
In re Mortimer In re Wilson Wilson v Mortimer act
In re A Williams In re J Williams Williams v Williams act
Williams v Simner act
Blackett v Blackett act
In re Welbourn Hunter v Burton act
Bellis v Johnson act
Beaumont v Beaumont act
Aberayon Mutual Ship, &c, Co, lmd v Jones act
Brewer v Jones act
In re Attfield In re Rowe Peck v Attfield act
Field v Ford act
Heinrichs v Westinghouse act
Jobbins v Standing act
Mayor, &c, of New Windsor v Stovell act
In re Griffits Pearson v Griffits act
Ferguson v Walker act
Newburn v Vacani act
Hooper v Sewell act
In re Joseph In re Penny Murray v Joseph act
In re J J Roebuck Scholes v Whitley act
Charlesworth v Skyes act
Cowgill v Rawson act
Measham v Thomas act
Perkin v Angel act

Before Mr. Justice PEARSON.
Causes for Trial (with witnesses).
In re The Phosphate Manure Co ld, Ex parte Hartmont mot
Bellmore v Watson act pt hd Jan 14
Theobald v Elwyn act
Davies v Turner act
Chapman v Clarke act
Attorney-General v Lyne act
Local Board &c of Witham v Oliver act
Edwards v Cory act
Ballard v Tomlinson act
Hawley v Camel act
Ager v Blacklock act
West London Dairy Socy v Abbott act
In re Hunt Robey v Hunt act
In re Harrison Harrison v Parry act
In re Cape Breton Co ld & Co's Acts adj sums
In re Pride Spring v Jones act & m f j
Burton v Gregory act
Jeffries v Jeffries act
Tudor v Tudor act
Holland v Sawbridge act
Bell v Browne act
Thompson v Mayor &c of Sunderld act
City Bank v Sovereign Life Assce Co act
Ord v Coombs act
Barrett v Roberts act
Firminger v Bruff act
Adams v Glynn act
In re Monkman Lyne v Monkman act
Carrington v Black act
In re J Mitchell Mitchell v Fenton act
Voght v Stocks & Co act
Beckett v Gill act
Wheeler v Sharland act
Wilcox v Same act
In re Pearson, Oxley v Scarth act
In re Owen, Lloyd v Owen act m f j
Dawson v Dawson act
In re Hooke Hooke v Parry act
In re Mappin Mappin v Vinrace adj sumns
In re Newington Hughes v Newington adj sumns
Salisbury v Wickham act
Standing v Bowring act
Solway v Hales Hales v Solway act
Singleton v Cracknell act
Jones v Milne act
Mitchell v Ford act
In re G Douglas In re Pawle De Pledge v Douglas act
Stephenson v Stephenson act
Exchange &c. Warehouses ld v Land Financiers ld act
Noyes v Pollock act and m f j
Lowenfeld v Hoyne act
In re Edwards Fisher v Edwards act
Mayor &c of Bristol v United Telephone Co ld action
Richmond v Studds act
Deacon v Luff act
In re Blakeley Wickham v Digby Digby v Wickham act and m f j
Bartholomew v Tippett act
Foster v Simpson act
Burrill v Padwick act
Atherley v Burnett act
Fendick v Hurter act
Bellamy v Rowbotham act
Farthing v Wells act
Weston v Stinger act
Rice v Broadley act and m f j
Drury v Bennett act and m f j
Gaskell v Philips & Co act
Lloyd's Banking Co ld v Jones act
Leigh v Burnell act
Bailey v House Property Trust ld act
Maull v Leslie act
Moss v Bradburn act
Sharp v Andrews act
Thomson v Carr act
Clark v Carr act
Barker v Allen act
Ewen v Sharp act
Cammell v Morris act
MacDougall v Knight act
Frere v Winslow
Durrant v Joy act
Lavery v Martin Fothergill v Lavery act
Bryant v Bennett act
Powell v Jones act
Scott v Graham act
Lancaster v Gould act
In re Gibson Nutter v Gibson act
Jones v North and South Wales Bank, lmd act

Causes for Trial (without witnesses).
Arnold v Allen act (restored)
In re Morgan Rees v Morgan m f j
Morris v Nell act
Bradford v Young act In re Falconar's Trusts Pet by order
In re Rosher Rosher v Rosher s c
Watts v Bennett act
Hyde v Hyde s c
Gow v Foster s c
In re Ormston Aldam v Ford m f j
Hunter v Caldecott m f j
In re Graver-Browne Hare v Hare s c
In re W Paddock Miller v Toll s c
In re Hodgkinson Thackray v Swinnerton m f j
In re Powell Owen v Powell act
Cole v Crush act
Clark v Saunders act
In re Lawrence Lawrence v Lawrence s c
McWilliam v Roome s c & m f j
Harrington v Heaven s c
Longden v Longden m f j
In re Prior Prior v Prior act
Carter v Hook act
In re Evans Phillips v Evans act
Cross v Coltart s c and m f j
Spencer v Princep m f j
Sadler v Bryan act
In re McLeod Harris v McLeod, m f j
In re Watts Cornford v Elliott s c
Waddington v Waddington m f j
Mutual Life Assurance Society v Langley act & m f j
Laurence v Nottingham Tramway Co, lmd fur trial of act & sums
In re Ridings Ridings v Barnes act
In re Hollis Hollis v Fletcher spl c & m f j
In re Shield Pethybridge v Burrow act
The Ecclesiastical Commissioners for England v Pearson act
In re Brooke Musgrave v Brooke act
Bates v Bates spl c
Coleman v Llewellin act
In re Baynton Baynton v Wherost act
Gross v Dymant s c
Carnochan v Ireland act
Jelly Dudley v Keightley s c
In re Tuthill Fox v Lucas act & m f j
Lord Muncaster v Skegness Pier Co m f j
In re Hall Hall v Hall m f j
Matkin v Gould m f j
Reynolds v Hillier act
In re Parsons Usher v Smith m f j
Walker v Maughan act
Tillett v Nixon act & m f j
Withall v Nixon act & m f j
Meakin v Cox s c
Mayor &c of Bristol v Geo m f j (short)
In re Pottingill Wood v Skipper act
Leigh v Steele act
Gallard v Hawkins s c
Crosse v Randall act
In re Laverick Barlow v Laverick act
Smith v Olding m f j (short)
Davies v Turner m f j
In re Coussens Coussens v Coussens m f j
Beck v Pollitzer act
In re Turnbull Turnbull v Turnbull s c
Wright v Little act
Nottingham Joint Stock Bank ld v Williams act
Knowles v Wynniatt act & m f j
In re Kirk Nicholson v Kirk act & m f j
House Property and Investment Co ld v Cornick act
Bray v D'Aubligne act
Heppenstall v Hose act
Hodge v Gillbanks m f j f (short)

Further Considerations.
In re Jones Jones v Davies f c
In re Hill Hill v Hill f c
In re Price Williams v Jenkins f c & 2 sums
In re Shaw Hastie v Jackson f c
In re Allingham Robinson v Jones f
In re Jordan King v Picard f c
In re Tilson Marshall v Marshall f c
In re Sayer McClellan v Clark f c
In re Bull Ball v Ball f c
In re Houghton Houghton v Brown f c
Fox v Dolby f c
In re Pegson Lees v Stanley f c
Lawrence v Lawrence 2nd f c & adj sums
In re Bailey Bailey v Bailey f c
Meredith v Salter f c
Guest v Newmes f c & sums
Hilton v Hilton f c (short)
Hastings v Hurley f c
In re Lee Helah v Hinks f c
Witham v Vane f c
In re Litchfield Jones v Litchfield f c
In re Swann Blythe v Harrison f c

Adjourned Summonses.
In re Serjeant Mertens v Walley pt hd
In re The Pandora Theatre Co ld
In re W Amers's Trusts & S L Act 1882
Id re Turner and sar
Hutchings v Humphreys
In re Bruce Hutchinson v Hutchinson
In re Edwin Storer
Moss v Bradburn
Lawrence v Perry & Co ld
Smith v Machare
Taylor v Poncia
In re Child Leaver v Child
In re Teall French v Andrews
In re Hill & Chapman & V & P Act 1874
In re Hobbins and L C Act 1845
In re Evans Austen Leigh v Hall-Say
In re Hulme Lever v Allen
Snelling v Pulling
Ash v Elwell
Daniell v Sewell
Litchfield v Jones
Same v Same
In re Ames Ames v Taylor
In re Nash & Field
In re Ray's Settled Estates & S E Act
In re Cheese's Contract with Jones
In re Daly Daly v Daly
In re Great Northern Ry with Sanderson &c
In re Hills Ward v Snowden
Batten v Wedgwood
Nicholls v Hudson
Hunt v Hudson
In re Belston Newmes v Belston
Noyes v Pollock
In re Neville-Grenville with Sinnott & V & P Act
In re Pierpoint Strapps v Killick
In re Same Same v Same
In re Wallis Wallis v Stocken
Pritchard v Jones
Cardinall v Cardinall

SUMMARY.

1.—V.C. BACON—Actions with and without Witnesses	.. .. ..	103	
Adjourned Summonses	.. ..	6	
		—	109
2.—Mr. Justice KAY—Witness Actions	.. ..	90	
Non-Witness Actions	.. ..	25	
Adjourned Summonses	.. ..	25	
Further Considerations	.. ..	26	
		—	166
3.—Mr. Justice CHITTY—Witness Actions	.. ..	82	
Non-Witness Actions including Summonses		121	
Further Considerations and Demurrer	..	12	
		—	215
4.—Mr. Justice NORTH—Witness Actions	.. ..		114
5.—Mr. Justice PEARSON—Witness Actions	.. ..	88	
Non-Witness Actions	.. .. ..	71	
Adjourned Summonses	.. .. ..	40	
Further Considerations	.. .. ..	22	
		—	221
Total Causes and matters for Hearing in the Chancery Division	..		825

COMPANIES.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

NEW LEICESTER FREEHOLD LAND AND BUILDING SOCIETY, LIMITED, Leicester. Jan 4

ROSE OF THE VALLEY LODGE PHILANTHROPIC INSTITUTION, Butchers' Arms, Blackwood, Monmouth. Jan 4

[*Gazette*, Jan. 8.]

It having been found that much of the inconvenience recently experienced from the draughts in several of the new law courts arose from the air penetrating the interstices of the tiles on the roof, and so entering the courts through several places in the ceilings where the woodwork had become warped, the various roofs have been lined with a covering of lath and plaster. In Appeal Courts I. and II. the seats for the reporters have been raised, so as to place them nearer to, and more on a level with, the judges.

SALES OF ENSUING WEEK.

Jan 16.—MR. DAVID J. CHATTELL, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold Security (see advertisement, Dec. 22, p. 4).

Jan. 15.—Messrs. DRIVER & Co., at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold Properties and Ground Rents (see advertisement, Jan. 5, p. 188).

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

FARQUHAR.—Jan. 5, at 18, Frogmore-street, Abergavenny, the wife of James Hervey Farquhar, solicitor, of a daughter.

MARSHALL.—Jan. 7, at Cannon-hill, Lancaster, the wife of J. Whaley Marshall, solicitor, of a son.

RUTHERFORD.—Jan. 2, at Tovil-house, Ealing, the wife of Henry Rutherford, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

SPARSHATT.—Jan. 3, the wife of Henry Sparshatt, of 93, Finborough-road, South Kensington, solicitor, of a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

EDMONDS—HENGLER.—Jan. 7, at Hampstead, Charles Ralph Augustus Edmonds, solicitor, of Leeds, to Mary Ann, third daughter of Charles Hengler, of Fitzjohn's-avenue, Hampstead.

SMYLY — BROOKS. — Jan. 2, at St Mary's, Watford, William Cecil Smyly, of 36, St. George's-square, S.W., barrister-at-law, to Alice Mary, daughter of the late Samuel William Brooks, of Watford.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, Jan. 4, 1884.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Smith, Thomas, Royal Exchange, Land Agent. Pet Dec 31. Hazlitt. Jan 23 at 12

To Surrender in the Country.

Antill, Alfred, Soho Hill, Stafford, Manufacturing Jeweller. Pet Dec 31. Cole. Birmingham, Jan 18 at 2

Bones, William Henry, Billinghay, Lincoln, Cattle Salesman. Pet Dec 29. Staniland. Boston, Jan 17 at 12

Cowell, John Herbert, and Timothy Cowell, Luton, Bedford, Grocers. Pet Dec 28. Cooke. Luton, Jan 16 at 11

James, George, Hanley, Stafford, Cattle Dealer. Pet Dec 31. Tennant. Hanley, Jan 17 at 11

Lowe, Francis, Manchester, Painter. Pet Dec 31. Lister. Manchester, Jan 21 at 12.30

Lowe, Thomas, Bold, nr St Helen's, Lancaster, Farmer. Pet Dec 31. Bellringer. Liverpool, Jan 17 at 12

May, Robert, Liverpool, Undertaker. Pet Dec 31. Bellringer. Liverpool, Jan 16 at 12

Nicholas, Walter James, Bristol, Solicitor. Pet Dec 31. Harley. Bristol, Jan 15 at 2

Potter, James, Liverpool, Horsedealer. Pet Dec 31. Bellringer. Liverpool, Jan 18 at 2.30

Roberts, Joseph, Llandaff Yard, nr Cardiff, Grocer. Pet Jan 1. Langley. Cardiff, Jan 16 at 12

Sharkey, J., Liverpool, Innkeeper. Pet Jan 2. Bellringer. Liverpool, Jan 16 at 11.30

Snell, John William, Leeds, Stock and Share Broker. Pet Dec 31. Marshall. Leeds, Jan 15 at 11

Snowden, Robert, Kingston upon Hull, Photographer. Pet Dec 29. Rollit. Kingston upon Hull, Jan 16 at 3

Thompson, Frederick, Urmstone Lodge, Wimbledon Park, Gent. Pet Dec 29. Bell. Kingston, Jan 17 at 4.30

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, Jan. 4, 1884.

Blake, Alfred, and Alfred J. Blake, Lower Sydenham, Kent. Jan 1

Evans, Thomas, Bontgoch, Llannon, Cardigan, Farmer. Dec 28

Liquidations by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, Jan. 4, 1884.

Allen, James, Barking, Essex, Farmer. Jan 17 at 3 at Golden Lion, Romford. Atkinson, Stratford

Amner, William, Rattray rd, Brixton, Baker. Jan 24 at 4 at office of Hewitt, King st, Cheapside. Biggenden, King st, Cheapside

Arkley, William Bellison, Liverpool, General Smith. Jan 18 at 12 at office of Chadwick and Thomas, Harrington st, Liverpool

Attwood, Thomas Gardner, Luton, Straw Hat Manufacturer. Jan 18 at 3 at Griffin Inn, Chapel st, Luton. Neve, Luton

Baker, Thomas, Birmingham, out of business. Jan 17 at 3 at office of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham

Barber, Henry, Lewisham, Kent, Builder. Jan 18 at 2 at Chard's Hotel, Abchurch lane, Cannon st. Coxwell, Laurence Pountney lane, Cannon st

Batten, Eliza Diana, Cardiff, Stationer. Jan 24 at 3 at office of Cozens and Co, High st, Cardiff. Rees, Cardiff

Bentley, Arthur Bradford, Newton Abbot, Devon, Tobacconist. Jan 17 at 11 at office of Southcott, Post office st, Exeter. Baker and Watts

Blenharn, Thomas, Old Leake, Lincoln, Farmer. Jan 17 at 12.30 at Peacock Hotel, Boston. Lucas, Louth

Bontoft, Seymour William, Mareham le Fen (not Wareham le Fen, as erroneously printed in Gazette of 21st ult), Lincoln, Licensed Victualler. Jan 14 at 11.30 at Bull Hotel, Horncastle. Bell and Ingoldby, Louth

Bowns, William Henry, Sheffield, Carriage Builder. Jan 19 at 12 at office of Clayton, Norfolk st, Sheffield

Bowyer, Barry, Little Ilford, Essex, Cattle Dealer. Jan 16 at 3 at office of Russell and Co, Budge row, Cannon st

Boxall, Henry, Bristol, Grocer. Jan 16 at 12 at 39, Broad st, Bristol. Miller, Bristol

Bradley, Charles Edwin, Rowley Regis, Stafford, Commission Agent. Jan 18 at 3 at office of Shakespeare, Church st, Oldbury

Bragg, William Fletcher, Balsall Heath, Worcester, Grocer. Jan 18 at 3 at office of Bayley, Colmore row, Birmingham

Brice, Samuel, Bruce rd, Bromley by Bow, Lighterman. Jan 17 at 12 at office of Crook and Carlill, Fenchurch st

Bromley, Joseph Samuel, East st, Walworth, Provision Dealer. Jan 11 at 3 at office of Cogswell, Museum st, Oxford st. Knight, Quality ct, Chancery lane

Brookfield, Charles Henry, Sheffield, Plumber. Jan 23 at 11 at Law Society, Hoole's chbrs, Bank st, Sheffield. Rhodes, Rotherham

Brown, Thomas, Thornton Heath, Surrey, Butcher. Jan 16 at 3 at office of Fowler and Co, Borough High st

Cannon, David McMurdo, Southport, Lancaster, Tea Merchant. Jan 21 at 11 at office of Bell and Wigmore, Crosshall st, Liverpool. Paynter, Birkenhead

Carson, David, Manchester, Draper. Jan 21 at 3 at Falstaff Hotel, Market pl, Manchester. Tremewen, Manchestrr

Caswell, Joseph Walter, Hendon, Baker. Jan 15 at 3 at offices of Ratcliff, Bishopsgate st Within

Cope, David, Liverpool, Oil Merchant. Jan 21 at 3 at offices of Banner and Co, Cook st, Liverpool. Crowther and Miller, Liverpool

Cordon, William, Nottingham. Jan 21 at 3 at office of Whittingham, Middle pavement, Nottingham

Crabb, Edmund, Melcombe Regis, Dorset, Lodging-house Keeper. Jan 21 at 2 at office of Bowen, East st, Weymouth

Cressey, James, Ruskington, Lincoln, Farmer. Jan 15 at 12 at office of Peak and Co, Sleaford

Cullen, Abraham, Bow rd, Auctioneer. Jan 17 at 2 at office of Paulin, Fen st, Fenchurch st

Darnell, John, Ellingford road, Mare st, Shoe Manufacturer, Jan 17 at 3 at office of Peddell, Guildhhall chbrs, Basinghall st

Dorling, Edward, Walton-on-the-Naze, Essex, out of business. Jan 25 at 11 at office of Marshall, Church st, North Colchester

Edwards, John, Bristol, Licensed Victualler. Jan 16 at 12 at office of Beckingham, Albion chbrs, Broad st, Bristol

Evans, Stephen, Wimbledon, Merchant. Jan 29 at 12 at Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Underwood and Co, Holles st, Cavendish sq

Eves, Thomas Paul, Hall green, out of business. Jan 16 at 3 at office of O'Connor, Bennett's hill, Birmingham

Eyles, Silas, King st, Hammersmith, Builder. Jan 28 at 12 at office of Hudson, Furnival's inn, Holborn hill

Fawcett, John, Kingston upon Hull, Bootmaker. Jan 22 at 3 at office of Martinson, Exchange bldgs, Bowlalley lane, Hull

Fisher, Edwin, West Bromwich, Stafford, Ironmonger. Jan 17 at 11 at office of Jackson, High st, West Bromwich

Foster, Samuel, Alderley Edge, Chester, Coal Merchant. Jan 21 at 3 at office of Cobbett and Co, Brown st, Manchester

Foster, William, Pontefract, York, Horse Dealer. Jan 16 at 11 at office of Fernandes, Cross sq, Wakefield

Garratt, Thomas, Nottingham, no business. Jan 10 at 3 at office of Norman, Middle pavement, Nottingham

Gaymond, James, Manchester, Chair and Sofa Maker. Jan 18 at 3 at office of Rycroft and Pickup, Brown st, Manchester

Goodall, William Henry, Upper Mount st, Tunstall, no occupation. Jan 15 at 3 at office of Hollinshead and Moody, Tunstall

Goodwin, Charles Barry, Portsea, Hants, Bootmaker. Jan 18 at 1 at 145, Chesapside. King, Portsea

Govier, John, Treforest, Glamorgan, Fishmonger. Jan 15 at 12 at office of Morgan, Church st chbrs, Pontypridd. Morgan and Rhys, Pontypridd

Goulding, Samuel Robert, Hoylake, Chester, Merchant. Jan 17 at 3 at office of Morris and Jones, Dale st, Liverpool

Griffiths, Thomas George, Ruthin, Denbigh, Draper. Jan 15 at 12 at Blossoms Hotel, Foregate st, Chester. Roberts, Rhyl

Guy, Thomas, Nottingham, Joiner. Jan 15 at 11 at office of Travell and Woodward, Victoria bldgs, Victoria st, Nottingham

Hadwen, William, Manchester Mineral Water Maker. Jan 28 at 3 at office of Sale and Co, Booth st, Manchester

Hargreaves, Joseph, Morley, York, Watchmaker. Jan 15 at 11 at office of Dale, Albion st, Leeds

Harper, Ezra, Horbury, nr Wakefield, York, Herring Curer. Jan 16 at 3 at office of Burton, Wood st, Wakefield

Harrison, Richard, Newbury, Berks, Builder. Jan 18 at 11 at Queen's Hotel, Newbury. Lucas, Newbury

Helps, William, and Charles Henry Helps, Cardiff, Dealers in Sewing Machines. Jan 16 at 11 at Grosvenor Hotel, Manchester, Cousins, Cardiff

Hemingway, Charles Benjamin, and William Henry Webster, Batley, York, Painters. Jan 16 at 11 at office of Truswell, Wellington st, Batley. Ridgway and Ridgway

Henshall, Peter, Stockport, Chester, Farmer. Jan 16 at 11 at office of Brown and Ainsworth, Petersgate, Stockport

Herbert, Henry Jacob, Charterhouse bldgs, Goswell rd, Maker of Fancy Articles. Jan 28 at 3 at 27, Chancery lane. Boxall and Boxall, Chancery lane

Herrod, Thomas, Babsworth, Nottingham, Farm Bailiff. Jan 22 at 4 at Cockayne, Fletcher gate, Nottingham

Heyhoe, Levi, Gt Grimsby, Innkeeper. Jan 14 at 11 at office of Grange and Wintringham, St Mary's chbrs, Gt Grimsby

Hill, George, St George, Gloucester, Beer Retailer. Jan 15 at 2 at office of Sibly and Dickinson, Exchange West, Bristol

Hilton, Elish, Gt Grimsby, Fish Curer. Jan 16 at 11 at office of Grange and Wintringham, St Mary's chbrs, Gt Grimsby

Hogg, Thomas, Gateshead, Spirit Merchant. Jan 21 at 2 at office of Keenlyside and Co, St John's chbrs, Newcastle upon Tyne

Holmes, Samuel, Heckington, Lincoln, Tailor. Jan 16 at 3 at office of Barnett, North st, Sleaford. Toynbee and Co, Lincoln

Holt, Charles Frederick, Rhodeswell rd, Limehouse, Oilman. Jan 28 at 3 at office of Cooper and Co, Lincoln's inn fields

Horsfield, John, Castleford, York, Tailor. Jan 16 at 3 at George Hotel, Huddersfield. Kaberry, Pontefract
Incell, Charles, Droitwich, Fruiterer. Jan 16 at 11.30 at office of Tree High st, Worcester
Ingman, William, Nottingham, General Dealer. Jan 15 at 11 at office of Rogers, Low pavement, Nottingham. Cranch, Nottingham
Isaacs, Michael Baber, New Broad st. Merch ant. Feb 14 at 2 at Cannon st Hotel, Cannon st. Spyer and Son, Old Broad st
Johnson, Edward, Kingston upon Hull, Jeweller. Jan 16 at 2 at Queen's Hotel, New st, Birmingham. Laverack
Johnston, William, North Shields, Stationer. Jan 14 at 10.30 at office of Scott, King st, South Shields
Jones, Henry, Plumstead, Cowkeeper. Jan 18 at 3 at 26, Plumstead rd. Cooper and Co, Lincoln's inn fields
Jones, Owen, Egiwysfach, Denbigh, Licensed Victualler. Jan 15 at 12.30 at office of Griffith and Allard, Llanrwst
Kendrick, Thomas, Cradley Heath, Stafford, Chain Manufacturer. Jan 18 at 11 at office of Homer, High st, Brierley Hill
Kenyon, Richard, Swinton, nr Manchester, Tailor. Jan 18 at 3 at office of Bowden and Walker, King st, Manchester
Kerr, George, and Thomas Garvey, Manchester, Hardware Merchants. Jan 22 at 2 at office of Makinson and Co, Blackfriars st, Manchester
Lambert, William James, Upper Easton, nr Bristol, Pig Dealer. Jan 16 at 12 at office of Paul, Corn st, Bristol
Lane, Rev. Francis Charles de Lona, East Dereham, Norfolk. Jan 22 at 2 at office of Gasquet and Metcalfe, Idol lane, Gt Tower st
Lavin, Nathan, Kingston upon Hull, Shoemaker. Jan 14 at 11 at office of Spur, Market pl, Hull
Lawrance, Henry, Euston villas, Wood green, Carman. Jan 23 at 3 at Masons' Hall Tavern, Basinghall st. Wenn, Bell yd, Temple Bar
Lay, John Watts, and Charles Smith, Wellingborough, Northampton, Carriage Builders. Jan 17 at 12 at office of Burnham and Henry, High st, Wellingborough
Leather, Frederick Jay, Graham rd, Mare st, Hackney, Shop Fitter. Jan 18 at 2 at Masons' Hall Taven, Masons' avenue. Fulcher, Charles sq, Hoxton
Lee, John, Cherry Burton, York, Farmer. Jan 19 at 11 at office of Pickering, Parliament st, Kingston-upon-Hull. Leak and Co, Kingston-upon-Hull
Lee, Thomas Marr, Holderness, York, Farmer. Jan 19 at 12 at office of Pickering, Parliament st, Kingston-upon-Hull. Leak and Co, Kingston-upon-Hull
Lewis, Philip Reynolds, Carmarthen, Butcher. Jan 16 at 3 at office of Morris, Red st, Carmarthen
Lillycraps, William Henry, Nottingham, Licensed Victualler. Jan 18 at 3 at office of Lees, Severn chbrs, Middle pavement, Nottingham
Livsey, James. St. Mary-le-Gill, York, Tailor. Jan 21 at 2 at office of Paget, Wilson's ct, Skipton
Lowe, Francis Newton, and Henry Augustus Williams, Lincoln, Merchants. Jan 25 at 12.30 at office of Tweed and Co, Saltergate
Manser, Albert, Southborough, Kent, Baker. Jan 18 at 1 at 30, Mount Pleasant, Tunbridge Wells. Buss, Tunbridge Wells
Markham, Charles, Maldon, Essex, Innkeeper. Jan 18 at 2 at Corn Exchange, Chelmsford. Tanner, Chelmsford.
Marment, Elizabeth. Penzance, Cornwall, Fruiterer. Jan 15 at 11 at office of Trythall and Bodilly, Clarence st, Penzance
Matravis, Alfred, Bristol, Baker. Jan 15 at 3 at office of Wansbrough, Lion chbrs, Broad st, Bristol
Matthews, Peter, Widnes, Lancaster, Grocer. Jan 21 at 3 at office of Husband, Ditton rd, Widnes
Mellor, William, Burslem, Stafford, Stonemason. Jan 16 at 11 at office of Ellis, Market pl, Burslem
Millett, Charles, Portsea, Hants, Grocer. Jan 16 at 3 at office of Walker and Walnscot, High st, Portsmouth
Moore, William Henry, Longton, Stafford, Furniture Maker. Jan 12 at 10.30 at office of Robinson, King st, Longton
Morris, Joseph George, Dewsbury, York, Grocer. Jan 15 at 3 at office of Shaw, Bond st, Dewsbury
Murray, Henry, Morcambe, Lancaster, Saddler. Jan 15 at 2 at office of Johnson, and Tilly, Sun st, Lancaster
Norris, Daniel, and Frederick Birchall Carter, Abchurch chbrs, Abchurch lane, Iron Ore Merchants. Jan 21 at 2 at office of Deller and Benwell, King st. Batters, Crown ct bldgs, Old Broad st
Orton, Alfred, Cheltenham, no business. Jan 23 at 11 at Great Western Hotel, Clarence st, Cheltenham
Ostler, John Charles, Wilson st, Finsbury, Coffee House Keeper. Jan 28 at 3 at office of Smith, Mark lane
Page, Newton Thomas, Colebrooke row, Islington, Jeweller. Jan 14 at 3 at office of Angier, Chancery lane
Paver, Thomas, South sq, Manchester sq, Greengrocer. Jan 16 at 3 at office of Reader and Hicks, Ely pl, Holborn
Pinn, Francis, Leather lane, Baker. Jan 14 at 4 at office of Young, Mark lane
Porcheron, William, and Etienne Henri Pierre Porcheron, Laurence-Pountney lane, Cannon st, Merchants. Jan 23 at 2 at office of Kilsby, College hill, Cannon st
Priske, John Homer, jun, Helston, Cornwall, Agent. Jan 22 at 1 at Haxell's Hotel, Strand. Dale, Penzance
Proctor, John, Birmingham, Fruit Salesman. Jan 14 at 10.15 at office of East and Smith, Old sq, Birmingham
Puddy, Charles Henry, Laurence-Pountney lane, Timber Merchant. Jan 28 at 12 at Cannon st Hotel. Lowless and Co,, Martin's lane, Cannon st
Pugh, John, Gorston, nr Liverpool, Grocer. Jan 17 at 2.30 at office of Jevons and Co, Sweeting st. Liverpool
Pullman, Robert, and Thomas Pullman, Charterhouse sq, Leather Dressers. Jan 14 at 2 at offices of Marreco and Darnell, Clement's inn, Strand. Darley and Cumberland, John st, Bedford row
Reddan, Eliza, Imperial arcade, Ludgate hill, Toy Dealer. Jan 17 at 3 at office of Bilney, Salisbury sq, Fleet st
Richardson, Ernest De Burgh, Formby, Lancaster, Bookkeeper. Jan 22 at 3 at offices of Snowball and Co, Crosshall st, Liverpool
Roberts, George, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Fishmonger. Jan 18 at 11 at office of Howell, Stepney st, Llanelly
Roberts, William, Nottingham, Joiner. Jan 21 at 3 at office of Bright, Pepper st, Nottingham
Robinson, Jane, Gosport, Hants, Baker. Jan 18 at 2 at office of Harvey and Harvey, High st, Gosport
Rudge, Andrew, Egremont, Chester, Draper. Jan 15 at 2 at office of Goffey and Co, Lord st, Liverpool
Ruff, William, Little Staughton, Bedford, Farmer. Jan 19 at 2 at office of Cranfield, Market sq, St. Neots
Sames, Jacob, Birmingham, Brick Manufacturer. Jan 17 at 11 at 1, Newhall st, Birmingham. Eaden, Birmingham
Scaife, George, York, Bricklayer. Jan 18 at 1 at office of Wilkinson, St. Helen's sq, York
Skellern, James, Congleton, Chester, Potato Dealer. Jan 18 at 3 at office of Ashmall, Albion st, Hanley
Smith, James, Alma rd, Ponder's End, Contractor. Jan 18 at 3 at office of Wolferstan and Co, Ironmonger lane
Stevens, Alfred John, Birmingham, Retail Brewer. Jan 16 at 3 at office of Wright and Marshall, New st, Birmingham
Stevenson, Urban, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Bottled Ale Merchant. Jan 18 at 12 at office of Randell, Frederick st, Lanelly

Stewart, George, Bristol, Printer. Jan 17 at 2 at Guildhall chbrs, Broad st, Bristol, Pigeon, Bristol
St George, Arthur French, Bucklersbury, Electrician. Jan 15 at 2 at office of Davis and Co, Coleman st
Stokes, George Edward, and Walter Hall, St Stephen's chmbrs, Telegraph st, Stock and Share Brokers. Jan 17 at 2 at office of Allingham and Pearce, Old Broad st
Stone, William Dalton, Gloucester, Corn Merchant. Jan 21 at 1 at Bell Hotel, Gloucester. Taynton and Son, Gloucester
Stones, Joseph, and Alfred Edwin Pane Stones, Smethwick, Stafford, Iron Manufacturers. Jan 17 at 1 at Queen's Hotel, Birmingham. Shakespeare, Oldbury
Strafford, William, Wakefield, Fruiterer. Jan 17 at 3 at office of Kemp, Barstow sq, Wakefield
Stratton, John, Rabley Heath, Hertford, Farmer. Jan 24 at 2 at Red Lion Hotel, Hatfield. Annesley, St Albans
Strofton, John, Fore st, Agent. Jan 16 at 12.30 at office of Crook and Carlill, Fenchurch st
Terret, Tom, Leeds, Grocer. Jan 18 at 2.30 at office of Butler and Middlebrook, Park sq, Leeds
Thompson, Theodore, Stanford Rivers, Essex, Farmer. Jan 15 at 3 at Lion Hotel, Ongar. Atkinson, Stratford
Twigg, William, Glentworth, Lincoln, Farmer. Jan 17 at 11 at office of Durance, Mint lane, Lincoln
Vickers, Thomas, Crewe, Labourer. Jan 22 at 3 at 31, Nantwich rd, Crewe. Warburton
Walker, Jacob, Horsington, Lincoln, Farmer. Jan 21 at 11 at office of Chatterhow and Elsey, Lindsey ct, Horncastle
Walker, John, Clevedon, Somerset, Grocer. Jan 16 at 2.30 at office of Phillips, Small st, Bristol. Salmon and Co, Bristol
Walters, Nelson, Oakham, Rutland, Nurseryman. Jan 19 at 12 at office of Hough and Tuck, Oakham
Watson, Harrison, Halifax, Saddler. Jan 18 at 11 at Hen and Chickens Hotel, New st, Birmingham. Longbottom, Halifax
Weatherley, Daniel, Builth, Brecon, Nurseryman. Jan 17 at 3 at office of Thomas, Builth. Williams and Co, Newtown
Webb, Charles, Croydon, out of business. Jan 19 at 12 at office of Dubois, Old Serjeants' inn. Johnson, Lombard ct
Weeden, John Collinson, Capel, Surrey, Licensed Victualler. Jan 21 at 11 at office of Hart and Co, High st, Dorking
White, Alfred, Central st, St Luke's, Builder. Jan 18 at 3 at office of Cooper and Co, Lincoln's inn fields
Wilde, Thomas, Stone, Worcester, Farmer. Jan 17 at 3 at office of Couchman and Co, Swan st, Kidderminster
Williams, James Theodore, Bristol, Tailor. Jan 18 at 2 at office of Sibly and Dickinson, Exchange West, Bristol
Wood, William, Brierley Hill, Stafford, out of business. Jan 16 at 11 at Swan Hotel, Hagley st, Stourbridge. Roskell, Stourbridge

TUESDAY, Jan. 8, 1884.

Ahrons, Leopold, Bradford, York, Stuff Merchant. Jan 18 at 11 at office of Rawson and Co, Piccadilly, Bradford
Allerton, George, Longton, Stafford, Potter. Jan 18 at 4 at office of Ashmall, Albion st, Hanley
Backholer, Horiti James, Pembridge villas, Bayswater, Builder. Jan 21 at 11 at Inns of Court Hotel, High Holborn. Williams, Cecil st, Strand
Balmont, James Jabez, Bristol, Builder. Jan 22 at 3 at office of Tribe and Co, Albion chbrs, Bristol. Osborne and Co, Bristol
Barlow, Albert Bigelow, and Sarah Barlow, Mount, Stone, Stafford, China Manufacturers. Jan 22 at 11 at Union Hotel, Longton. Clarke and Hawley, Longton
Bays, John Bonfoy Rooper, Brighton, Importer of Foreign Goods. Jan 21 at 3 at office of Goodman, North st, Brighton
Bentley, John, Denholme Gate, nr Bradford, York, Innkeeper. Jan 21 at 11 at office of Beverley and Freeman, Hustlergate, Bradford
Boucher, Joseph, Newnham, Gloucester, Railway Waggon Builder. Jan 21 at 1 at Bell Hotel, Gloucester. Goold, Newnham
Bowater, William Alfred, Bournemouth, Hants, Coal Merchant. Jan 23 at 3 at office of Hill, 12, Arcade, Bournemouth
Bragg, Charles, James, Hastings, Sussex, Beerhouse Keeper. Jan 21 at 3 at office of Savery, Trinity st, Hastings
Burrow, Charles, Leeds, Boot and Shoe Maker. Jan 18 at 11 at Law Institute, Albion pl, Leeds. Scatcherd and Hopkins, Leeds
Chandler, George, Stewkley, Buckingham, Butcher. Jan 17 at 11 at Park Hotel, Bletchley rd, Fenny Stratford. Smith, Fenny Stratford
Christey, Alfred Joseph, Mortlake, Surrey, Herb and Root Dealer. Jan 22 at 3 at office of Cooper and Co, Lincoln's inn fields
Coley, Samuel, Rowley Regis, Stafford, Grocer. Jan 18 at 11 at office of Wright, High st, Cradley Heath, nr Brierley hill
Curle, John William, Leeds, Cooper. Jan 22 at 11 at office of Stott and Yewdall, East parade, Leeds
Daymon, Charles, Duncan ter, Islington, Cab Owner. Jan 22 at 3 at office of Andrews and Mason, Ironmonger lane. Castle, Poultry
Dodds, James, North Shields, Northumberland, Grocer. Jan 15 at 10.30 at office of Scott, King st, South Shields
Doherty, Mark, Leeds, Manure Merchant. Jan 21 at 3 at office of Ford and Warren, Albion st, Leeds
Edwards, John, Addley Green, Stafford, Grocer. Jan 18 at 3 at office of Ashmall, Albion st, Hanley
Edwards, John Sumner, Everton, Nottingham, Brewer. Jan 21 at 12 at office of Mee and Co, Churchgate, East Retford
Evans, Robert, Harlech, Merioneth, Cattle Dealer. Jan 23 at 2 at British Hotel, Bangor. Davies, Dolgelley
Everingham, George Galland, Howden, York, Tailor. Jan 21 at 3 at Queen's Hotel, Wellington st, Leeds. Stead and Sibree, Kingston upon Hull
Franklin, James, Dunstable, Carpenter. Jan 25 at 3 at George Hotel, Luton. Benning and Son, Dunstable
Furrall, Henry, Richmond, Auctioneer. Jan 16 at 2 at office of Lowther, Kew rd, Richmond
Galli, Charles, and James Galli, Leeds, Gas Stove Manufacturers. Jan 21 at 11 at office of Dale, Albion st, Leeds
Genn, Billett, Ely, Cambridge, Schoolmaster. Jan 23 at 12 at Bell Hotel, Ely. Hall, Ely
Godwin, Henry, City rd, Oilman. Jan 16 at 2 at office of Coombes and Temple, Chiswell st. Ogle, Chiswell st
Handley, William, Birmingham, Boot Manufacturer. Jan 18 at 11.45 at office of Phillips, Old sq, Birmingham
Hardman, James William, and Benjamin Hardman, Leeds, Wine Merchant. Jan 21 at 12 at office of Pullan, Albion st, Leeds
Hickman, Charles, Cardington, Bedford, Brewer. Jan 23 at 12 at office of Sharman and Smail, St Paul's sq, Bedford
Hobbs, James, Leicester, Bootmaker. Jan 21 at 3 at office of Gee, Friar lane, Leicester
Hodgson, Henry, Huddersfield, Painter. Jan 18 at 3 at office of Welsh, Queen st, Huddersfield
Horley, Joseph, jun, Rotherhithe, Carman. Jan 16 at 2 at Chard's Hotel, Abchurch lane, Cannon st. Coxwell, Laurence-Pountney lane Cannon st
Horne, Henry, Stoke upon Trent, Stafford, Music Seller. Jan 19 at 11.30 at North Staffordshire Railway Hotel, Winton sq, Stoke upon Trent. Snow, Hanley

Horsfall, William Brett, Red Lion sq, Glue Merchant. Jan 24 at 2 at office of Lindus and Bicknell, Cheapside
Hughes, Jane, Schoolmistress, Birmingham. Jan 17 at 11.30 at office of Goodrick and Co, Newhall st, Birmingham
Hutchens, Thomas Samuel, Streatham Common, Builder. Jan 16 at 11 at Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Chamberlain, Kempshott rd, Streatham Common
Jackson, Beetham, Musical and Dramatic Agent. Jan 28 at 3 at office of Le Vol, Lombard st
Lane, Thomas Bruce, Fulham pk gardens, Fulham, Gent. March 25 at 2 at 33, Gresham st. Jerome, Poultry
Lidderdale, Charles Sillem, Alma sq, St John's Wood, Artist. Jan 16 at 3 at office of Davis, Cork st, Burlington gardens
Lowes, Ralph, Grangetown, nr Middlesborough, York, Draper. Jan 17 at 1.30 at Bull and Mouth Hotel, Briggate, Leeds. Lewis, Middlesborough
Martin, Joseph, South Shields, Durham, Coal Teamer. Jan 18 at 3 at office of Newlands, King st, South Shields
Merry, Chandler Robertson, Ashwell, Hertford, Farmer. Jan 10 at 11 at Rose and Crown Inn, Ashwell. Wortham and Dalton Nash, Royston
Milner, David, Guiseley Brick Works, York, Brick Maker. Jan 24 at 12 at office of Bond and Co, Albion pl, Leeds
Moore, Edwin, and John Hall, Stafford, Shoe Makers. Jan 18 at 2 at office of Bowen, Martin st, Stafford
Moseley, William Henry, Bath, Dentist. Jan 18 at 3 at office of Titley, Orange grove, Bath
Norris, Daniel, and Frederick Birchall Carter, Abchurch chbrs, Abchurch lane, Iron Ore Merchants. Jan 21 at 3 at office of Deller and Benwell, King st. Batters, Crown crt bldgs, Old Broad st
Phillips, John Oliver Chapman, Birmingham, Surgeon. Jan 21 at 12 at Midland Hotel, New st, Birmingham. Taylor
Porcheron, William, and Etienne Henri Pierre Porcheron. Laurence Pountney lane, Cannon st, Merchants. Jan 28 at 2 at office of Kilsby, 21, College hill, Cannon st
Porter, Frederick James, Norwich, Grocer. Jan 15 at 12 at office of Bavin and Daynes, Castle Meadow, Norwich
Prax, William, Salford, Lancaster, Tailor. Jan 22 at 3 at office of Sampson and Price, Princess st, Albert sq, Manchester
Price, Edward, and Thomas Gwynne Eastman, Bristol, Wire Worker. Jan 21 at 12 at office of Phillips, Small st, Bristol. Salmon and Co, Bristol
Price, Robert, Claines, Worcester, Innkeeper. Jan 23 at 11 at office of Corbett, Avenue House, the Cross, Worcester
Price, Thomas, Frome, Somerset, Saddler. Jan 21 at 3 at office of McCarthy, King st, Frome
Rixom, Edwin, Badby, Northampton, Horse Dealer. Jan 19 at 3 at office of Becke and Green, Market sq, Northampton
Scarby, Joseph, Queen st pl, Cannon st, Advertising Agent. Jan 17 at 2 at Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue, Basinghall st. Knight, Quality ct, Chancery lane
Seller, Henry, Chester, Bootmaker. Jan 22 at 2.30 at office of Royle, Newgate st, Chester
Smith, George, Crowle, Lincoln, Farmer. Jan 24 at 3 at Cross Keys Hotel, Crowle. Newborn, Epworth, Doncaster
Spalton, Wilfrid Evelyn, Burton on Trent, Stafford, Grocer. Jan 22 at 12 at Midland Hotel, Station st, Burton on Trent. Bright, Burton on Trent
Squirrell, Mary Jane, Manchester, House Furnisher. Jan 21 at 3 at office of Farrington, Princess st, Manchester
Stott, Richard Gill, Guisborough, York, Shoemaker. Jan 16 at 3 at office of Draper, Finkle st, Stockton on Tees
Symons, Joseph, Gwinear, Cornwall, Farmer. Jan 18 at 11 at office of Daniell and Thomas, Chapel st, Camborne
Taylor, John, Walsall, Stafford, Bootmaker. Jan 21 at 4 at office of Brookes, Oriel chbrs, Bridge st, Walsall
Whitley, John Beckwith, Leeds, Linen Manufacturer. Jan 18 at 11 at office of Grisdale, Gt George st, Leeds
Williams, Henry Augustus, Lincoln, Merchant. Jan 25 at 4 at office of Padley, Paltry chbrs, Silver st, Lincoln
Wood, George, Kingston on Hull, Engineer. Jan 18 at 3 at office of Gregson, Exchange bldgs, Kingston on Hull. Thorp, Hull
Webb, Joseph, Leeds, Carver. Jan 18 at 11 at office of Butler and Middlebrook, Park sq, Leeds
Westover, Friend, Lewisham, Grocer. Jan 18 at 2 at Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Lockyer, Deptford
Wright, John Thomas, South Stockton, York, Innkeeper. Jan 21 at 3 at office of Faber and Fawcett, Finkle st, Stockton on Tees
Yates, Joseph, Darlaston, Hay Merchant. Jan 17 at 11 at office of Green, Church st, Darlaston
Yeend, Joseph, Staunton, Worcester, Bricklayer. Jan 17 at 3 at Swan Inn, Staunton. Jackson, Gloucester
Young, James, York, Licensed Victualler. Jan 19 at 11 at office of Anderson and Lythe, Stonegate, York

THE BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883.

Receiving Orders.

FRIDAY, Jan. 4, 1884.

Williams, William, Hamfrith rd, Stratford, Corn, Flour, and Malt Factor. High Court of Justice in Bankruptcy. Pet Jan 2. Ord Jan 2. Exam Jan 22 at 11
Ainsworth, William, Accrington, Lancashire, Hay and Straw Dealer. Blackburn. Pet Jan 3. Ord Jan 3. Exam Jan 14
Broddell, William, Ramsgate in Louth, Lincoln, Builder. Great Grimsby. Pet Jan 1. Ord Jan 1. Exam Jan 18
Line, Benjamin, Woburn Sands, Wavendon, Bucks, Corn Dealer. Northampton. Pet Jan 3. Ord Jan 3. Exam Jan 30

First Meeting.

Broddell, William, Ramsgate in Louth, Lincolnshire, Builder. Great Grimsby. Jan 15 at 11. Townhall, Louth

Receiving Orders.

TUESDAY, Jan. 8, 1884.

Williams, John, Pontypool, Monmouthshire, and York rd, King's Cross. High Court of Justice in Bankruptcy. Pet Jan 2. Ord Jan 4. Exam Jan 22 at 11
Elliott, Alwin Laurence, Brighton, Sussex, out of business. Brighton. Pet Jan 1. Ord Jan 3. Exam Jan 10 at noon
Curtis, Henry, Cardiff, Grocer. Cardiff. Pet Jan 3. Ord Jan 5. Exam Jan 18
Macey, Henry Salisbury, Lowestoft, Suffolk, Fishing Boat Owner. Great Yarmouth. Pet Jan 4. Ord Jan 4. Exam Jan 19
Hughes, William, Newcastle upon Tyne, General Draper. Newcastle on Tyne. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Jan 17
Cordon, William, Nottingham, Contractor. Nottingham. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Feb 19
Smith, Robert, Cotterstock, near Oundle, Northamptonshire, Miller and Farmer. Peterborough. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Jan 23
Goodfellow, Nathan, Salford, Lancashire, Timber Merchant. Salford. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Jan 16 at 2
Storey, James, Sheffield, Yorkshire, Tailor and Draper. Sheffield. Pet Jan 4. Ord Jan 4. Exam Jan 17 at 11.30
Robertson, James, Whitehaven, Accountant and Share Broker. Whitehaven. Pet Jan 5. Ord Jan 5. Exam Jan 21 at 11.30
Price, James, Aston Fields, Stoke Prior, Worcestershire, Coal Merchant. Worcester. Pet Jan 4. Ord Jan 4. Exam Jan 9

First Meetings.

Williams, William, Hamfrith rd, Stratford, Corn, Flour, and Malt Factor. High Court of Justice. Jan 16 at noon. 4, New ct, Lincoln's inn
Ainsworth, William, Accrington, Lancashire, Hay and Straw Dealer. Blackburn. Jan 17 at 3. Peel's Arms Hotel, Whalley rd, Accrington
Elliott, Alwin Laurence, Brighton, out of business. Brighton. Jan 17 at noon. Office of the Official Receiver, 160, North st, Brighton
Line, Benjamin, Woburn Sands, Wavendon, Bucks, Corn Dealer. Northampton. Jan 16 at 12.30. Office of Official Receiver, County Court bldgs, Northampton
Robertson, James, Whitehaven, Accountant and Share Broker. Whitehaven. Jan 18 at noon. 67, Duke st, Whitehaven
Price, James, Aston Fields, Stoke Prior, Worcestershire, Coal Merchant. Worcester. Jan 18 at 12. Office of Official Receiver, 45, Copenhagen st, Worcester

Adjudications.

Williams, John, Pontypool, Monmouthshire, and York rd, King's Cross. High Court of Justice in Bankruptcy. Jan 2. Jan 4
Macey, Henry Salisbury, Lowestoft, Suffolk, Fishing Boat Owner, Great Yarmouth. Jan 4. Jan 4
Price, James, Aston Fields, Stoke Prior, Worcestershire, Coal Merchant. Worcester. Jan 4. Jan 4

The Subscription to the Solicitors' Journal *is—Town, 26s.; Country, 28s.; with the* Weekly Reporter, *52s. Payment in advance includes Double Numbers and Postage. Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s. 6d.*

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Country, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

CONTENTS.

Current Topics	189	Societies	197
The Patents, Designs, and Trade-Marks Rules	191	Law Students' Journal	198
The New Bankruptcy System	192	Obituary	198
Reviews	194	Legal Appointments	198
Correspondence	195	Mr. Daniel, Q.C., on the New Bankruptcy Act	199
The New Practice:—		Court Papers	200
Judges' Chambers	195	Companies	205
Deeds of Assignment for General Benefit of Creditors	196	London Gazettes, &c., &c.	206

Notices to Correspondents.—*All communications intended for publication in the* Solicitors' Journal *must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer.*

The Editor does not hold himself responsible for the return of rejected communications.

*** *The Publisher requests that early application should be made by persons desirous of obtaining back numbers of the* Solicitors' Journal, *as only a small number of copies remain on hand.*

SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA,

Anti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.
Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa of the Finest Quality, with the excess of fat extracted.

The Faculty pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for Breakfast, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for Invalids and Children."

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.

Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates, keeps for years in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoas THICKENED yet WEAKENED with starch, &c., and IN REALITY CHEAPER than such Mixtures.

Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Breakfast Cup, costing less than a halfpenny.

COCOATINA A LA VANILLE is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Manilla Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is prohibited.

In tins at 1s. 6d., 3s., 5s. 6d., &c., by Chemists and Grocers.

Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietors,
H. SCHWEITZER & Co., 10, Adam-st., Strand, London, W.C.

ESTABLISHED 1825.

HEWETSON, THEXTON, & PEART,

MANUFACTURERS AND HOUSE FURNISHERS,

200, 202, and 204, TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, W.

Estimates and Designs submitted free for entirely Furnishing Residences, Chambers, Offices, &c.

—PAINTING, DECORATING, & HOUSE REPAIRS.—

Carved Oak Furniture, Reproductions from Ancient Designs, &c. Bedroom Furniture, including Bedstead and Bedding, from £7 10s per set.

THIRTY LARGE SHOW ROOMS.

HEWETSON, THEXTON, & PEART,

200, 202, and 204, Tottenham Court-road, London, W.

N.B.—Household Furniture Warehoused or Removed on reasonable terms.

EDE AND SON,

ROBE MAKERS

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London &c.

ROBES FOR QUEEN'S COUNSEL AND BARRISTERS.

SOLICITORS' GOWNS

Law Wigs and Gowns for Registrars, Town Clerks, and Clerks of the Peace

CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS

ESTABLISHED 1689.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON